DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 710 EA 012 840

AUTHOR	Kron, Jon
TITLE	Pennsylvania School Improvement Program. School Site Case Study: Site 5056.
INSTITUTION	Governor's Task Force on Community Schools, Tallahassee, Fla.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 80
CONTRACT	400-76-0094
NOTE	112p.: Some pages may be marginally legible due to broken print of original document. For related documents, see EA 012 835-844 and ED 172 432.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies: Change Agents: *Change Strategies: *Curriculum Development: Educational Assessment: Educational Improvement: Elementary Education: Information Services: Linking Agents: Needs Assessment: Program Development: Questionnaires: Reading Programs: State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania School Improvement Program

ABSTRACT

The Pennsylvania School Improvement Program (PSIP) was created to assist local schools and school districts in the development of curriculum improvement strategies. The process involves the use of "linkers," curriculum specialists who work with teams from the local level to ascertain needs, then connect the local teams with the research and development agencies that can provide information and resources to help meet those needs. This document describes one rural elementary school's experience using PSIP in an effort to improve its reading program. During the period from August, 1976, to February, 1979, this school successfully went through needs assessment, program selection, and preparation for implementation of the selected program. Materials used in these activities are included in appendixes. The report concludes that PSIP proved successful in this case, introducing a change process into a regressive and disadvantaged district, providing in-depth planning for a group of teachers, changing teaching behavior, raising vital curricular issues, and providing a means for solving problems. In general, PSIP is reported to have helped a traditional school discover how effective cooperative planning for educational improvement can be. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189710

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL SITE CASE STUDY

Site 5056

This report was prepared as part of the Research and Development Utilization Program for:

National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20028

Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Office of Research, Planning and Data Management
Pennsylvania Department of Education

January 1980

EA 012 840

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

SCHOOL SITE CASE STUDY

Site 5056

This report was prepared as part of the Research and Development Utilization Program for:

National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20028

The work upon which this report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-76-0094 with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education and no official endorsement by those agencies is intended or inferred.

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Staff

Jay Smink, *Director*

Peg Stank, *Evaluator*

Report Writer

Jon Kron

Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Office of Research, Planning and Data Management
Pennsylvania Department of Education

AUG 4 1980

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

SITE CASE STUDY
FOR
SITE 5056

Prepared by:

Dr. Jon Kron
Case Study Writer

May 1, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I - THE CONTEXT 1

A. The Project 1
Objectives 1
Structure and Resources 1, 2
Strategies and Activities 2, 3

B. The Site 4
General Background 4
Setting 4
School District 5
Building Level Site 6
Local Action Team 6

PART II - PSIP Activities at School 5056 8

A. Entry/Selection Phase 8
General Overview Meeting 8
On-Site Orientation Session 8, 9, 10
The Pulse Session 10
Summary of School Site 5056 Pulse Session 10, 11, 12

B. Needs Identification Phase 13

Introduction to Needs Analysis 13, 14
Student Needs Analysis 15, 16, 17
Analyzing Program Needs 16, 17, 18, 19

C. Selection Phase 20

Introduction to Selection 20, 21
Second Selection Session 21, 22, 23
Third Selection Session 23, 24

D. Implementation Phase 25

First Implementation Session 25
Second Implementation Session 26, 27, 28
Third Implementation Session 28
Fourth Implementation Session 29
Fifth Implementation Session. 29, 30
Sixth Implementation Session 30

PART III - General Discussion 32

A. Discussion of Entry/Initiation Activities 32
Role Description 32
Outcomes 32, 33

B. Discussion of Needs Assessment Activities 33
Role Description 33, 34
Outcomes 34, 35

C. Discussion of Selection Activities 35
Role Description 35
Outcomes 35, 36

D. Discussion of Implementation Activities 36
Role Description 36
Outcomes 37

PART IV - Analysis of PSIP at Site 5056 . . . . . 40, 41, 42

APPENDICES

Appendix I -"Pulse" Visit Questions 44
Appendix II -General Needs Statement 49
Appendix III -Student Needs Assessment Chart 50
Appendix IV -Boetel Test Scores 52
Appendix V -Self Concept/Attitude Test Scores 53
Appendix VI -Discrepancy Chart 54
Appendix VII -Comprehension Score Data 55
Appendix VIII -Stanford Achievement Test 62
Appendix IX -Program Analysis Report 63
Appendix X -Administrator Questionnaire Results 75
Appendix XI -Program Needs Statement 77
Appendix XII - Student Needs Assessment Chart 78
Appendix XIII -Detailed Student Needs Statement 81
Appendix XIV -Selection Criteria 83
Appendix XV -Implementation Planning Chart 84, 85
Appendix XVI -PATL Evaluation Interview 92
Appendix XVII -PATL Visitation Form 94

INDEX

ABT INDEX 95

PART I: CONTEXT

A. The Project

The Pennsylvania School Improvement Project: Objectives, Structure, Resources, Strategies and Major Activities

Objectives

The Pennsylvania School Improvement Program (PSIP) links the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Northwest Tri-County and Colonial Northampton Intermediate Units, and research and development agencies with ten pilot school districts to provide assistance in improving basic skills instructional programs. The research agencies are: (1) Research for Better Schools, (2) Research and Information Services for Education, and (3) The Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh.

PSIP'S objectives are, first, to help schools analyze their needs in the basic skills area and second, to help schools improve student performance in basic skills using the best available instructional programs and techniques produced by research and development activities.

Structure and Resources

The basic structure of PSIP is built upon the concept of an Intermediate Unit Linkage person serving as an educational extension agent who facilitates two-way communication between a local school and sources of R & D outcomes/products. This Linker is supported by a team of persons from the R & D agencies that provides technical assistance to a school site through the Linker. This team is called, for PSIP purposes, a School Assistance Team (SAT). The SAT always, includes staff members from one or more of the participating agencies, a person with expertise in the content area of interest to the school site and IU Linker. The SAT works cooperatively with a Local Action Team (LAT) and selected by the site school to analyze both student and program needs and then to select and to implement an R & D outcome appropriate to these needs.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education is responsible for managing the directing of PSIP activities. The participating agencies are described in the following paragraphs:

The Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC).--The mission of the LRDC, part of the University of Pittsburgh, is to develop, study and evaluate adaptative educational environments for schools. LRDC has had experience in instructional design, curriculum analysis, policy, analysis, teacher education and computer application in education.

Research for Better Schools (RBS).--RBS is a private non-profit educational laboratory established in 1966. Its mission is (1) to research and develop instructional systems and materials to improve educational processes for pre-school through adult programs and (2) to assist regional education agencies in preparing and carrying out changes in the educational program.

Research and Information Services for Education (RISE).--RISE operates under the primary sponsorship of the Montgomery County Intermediate Unit in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education. RISE has broad experience in disseminating information on curriculum research drawn from local, state and national resources.

The Intermediate Units (IUs).--The State's IUs provide consultative, advisory and program services to local schools. An IU coordinator serves as a full-time Linkage agent to provide assistance to schools involved in PSIP activities.

Strategies and Activities

There are four major strategies in the PSIP process: (1) Needs Assessment, (2) Knowledge Consolidation, (3) Selection and (4) Implementation. Each of the major processes incorporates planned and structured LAT/SAT workshop-type activities as well as follow-up assistance by the IU Linkage person to supplement each major workshop. These sequential inter-related processes will result in an upgrading of the LAT's skill in the use of needs analysis techniques to improve instruction, in the documentation of priority areas for improving the basic skills program and in SAT technical assistance to the LAT in reviewing and selecting available options and implementing educational changes.

Needs Assessment.--Needs assessment is the first phase of school participation. The LAT works cooperatively with the SAT in a problem-solving process to analyze student needs and program needs. There are three major activities involved in needs assessment. Each major activity requires formal LAT/SAT workshop sessions coordinated by the Linker. The three major activities are described below:

ORGANIZING THE NEEDS ANALYSIS.--This meeting provides the Local Action Team (LAT) with an overview of the needs analysis process, helps them begin to function as a problem solving team, and focuses on a general area of need for later concentration. The major objectives are to orient the LAT to the entire needs analysis process and to help the group begin to function as an effective problem solving team and to develop a general statement of the school needs on the basis of a review of school data. The Research Utilizing Problem-Solving (RUPS) materials are used during this activity. The outcome of the session is the appointment of an LAT coordinator and a general problem statement for the school.

ANALYZING STUDENT NEEDS.--These sessions are designed to identify the discrepancy between desired student performance and current student performance and to prepare a detailed statement of student needs on the basis of that discrepancy. The structured sessions are based on Curriculum and Instruction: Planning Improvement, a handbook developed by RBS. The outcomes of the student needs analysis sessions are: (1) a chart showing desired student performance in a basic skill area, standards for this performance and a description of the target population, (2) a chart showing current student performance in these areas, (3) a discrepancy analysis of these charts, and (4) a detailed statement of student needs.

ANALYZING PROGRAM NEEDS.--The purpose of this phase is to identify aspects of the current educational program which might be strengthened in order to improve student performance in the defined need area. The materials used for program analysis are: a model of classroom processes developed by research at LRDS, instrumentation based on the variables from this model, and data from other needs analyses activities.

During the program analysis sessions, the LAT is provided with an overview of the factors which R & D suggest relate to student performance. The LAT then decides which of these variables should be investigated. Instruments are constructed and data are collected by the LAT and the Linker. The SAT analyzes the data and submits a summary of the findings to the LAT for consideration in producing a statement of program needs.

Knowledge Consolidation.--This phase consists of an Outcome Search and a comprehensive Literature Search on what research and development says about (1) basic skills learning and instructional theory and general learning theory, (2) principles of diffusion and dissemination activities, and (3) school organization and curriculum development processes. The Outcome Search identifies effective educational practices in basic skills instruction, screens the educational practices for validity and availability and analyzes them using criteria developed by the LAT during the needs definition phase. A bank of appropriate, usable alternative practices for basic skills instruction is then submitted to the LAT for consideration.

The Knowledge Consolidation activities are initiated as soon as the LAT generates a general problem statement at the first needs assessment session. Data is entered into Knowledge Consolidation as it is generated by the LAT.

The Selection Process.--During the selection process, the LAT develops selection criteria related to local school conditions, screens possible educational practices using these standards, selects the practice that best meets the standards and produces a general plan for implementing the educational practice selected. During this activity, the LAT is first presented with a set of R & D outcomes selected by the Knowledge Consolidation component using the data generated by the student needs analysis and the program analysis activities. These R & D alternatives are reviewed and screened by the LAT using site-specific criteria. There are two or three elimination rounds in the process. The outcome is the selection of some R & D product/process for implementation.

The Implementation Process.--The LAT and the SAT work together to develop a realistic plan for implementing a change in the school curriculum. Staff members are trained, and the new instructional process becomes operational. The SAT provides technical assistance to the LAT in evaluating the effectiveness of the new procedures and assists in modifications when necessary.

B. The Site

General Background of PSIP Site 5056

Setting

PSIP Site 5056 is one elementary school located in a rural area of northwestern Pennsylvania. The school district is situated in a county bordered by the State of Ohio along its western boundary, Lake Erie along its northern boundary, Crawford County along its southern boundary, and the townships of Girard, Franklin, and Washington to the east. Along the shoreline, the district is over fifteen miles from the western Erie City line. Thus it falls within the Erie Metropolitan area and its regional location places it within 100 miles of Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo and along major east-west transportation routes which follow the lake frontage.

In area, the district measures 122.9 square miles - Platea being the largest of the boroughs with approximately four square miles of area. For the most part, except for the lower southeast corner of Elk Township, which drains to the south, the entire district slopes upward from Lake Erie at an elevation of 600 feet to the "Lake Erie Drainage Divide" with an elevation of 1.200 feet. Much of the district near the lake is in the level Lake Erie lakeplain which is interrupted only occasionally by rather shallow creek valleys. Raccoon, Little Elk and Crooked Creeks flow into Lake Erie from the district, while Turkey Creek and a rather extensive Conneaut Creek including all of its tributaries - East and West branches. Marsh Run and Temple Creek flow into Ohio before emptying into the lake. Cusewago Creek, at the southeastern corner of Elk Creek Township flows south, eventually joining French Creek.

The earliest settlers in the district arrived in 1795 from the eastern states and from New England. One of the moravian Grant tracts, consisting of 2,797 acres in Springfield and Conneaut Townships, given by the state in 1791 were leased until 1850 and later sold and distributed in smaller parcels. The Borough of Albion was incorporated in 1861 taking an area one mile square in Conneaut Township. Cranesville Borough was incorporated from part of Elk Creek and Conneaut Townships in 1912. East Springfield Borough was incorporated from Springfield Township between 1890 and 1900. Platea Borough was originally Lockport Borough established in 1870 in Girard Township but changed its name in 1903.

In addition to the boroughs of the district, early growth established communities at West Springfield and North Springfield in Springfield Township; Albion Depot, Keepville and Cherry Hill in Conneaut Township; and Wellsburg and Pageville in Elk Creek Township. Each village developed its own commercial centers and residential groupings. Many of the villages declined because of a changing economy or a shifting of a transportation route, such as the Erie Canal which created Lockport (now Platea Borough).

The communities of the district are predominately Caucasian and Protestant. These pockets of population are on the fringe of a growing metropolitan area, the impact of which is minor and will continue to exert relatively little effect on these basically agricultural communities. As are typical of communities that combine rural and urban economies and ways-of-life, wide ranges of income and attitudes have learned to live side-by-side. The location of a mammoth U.S. Steel plant on the Ohio and Pennsylvania border is predicted to have far reaching impact on the area. However, the near term situation will remain unchanged.

School District

The school district serves approximately 2,823 students with a staff of 136 professionals. There are three elementary buildings and two secondary buildings in the district. Twenty to thirty per cent of the graduates seek post-secondary education. The remainder of seventy per cent attempt employment in the industrial-commercial centers of Ashtabula, Ohio and Erie, Pennsylvania.

The district has established the following statement as a guide for its reading programs:

> Our goal for our reading program will be success for all children. This does not mean that all children will be able to read at the same level of difficulty at any given time during the school year. Rather, it means that all children will have mastered what they have been taught and will be able to read well the material appropriate to their level of skills. This means that children will need to be provided varying lengths of times and numbers of repetitions in order to achieve mastery of the elements. A program of prevention of reading difficulties will be started from the beginning of grade one.[1]

In addition to impact of geographical and topographical features, there are other curricular conditions which currently exist in the school district and which have direct bearing on curriculum development and innovation in the school system. Fourteen important curricular conditions are: (1) This is a rural area. Many children live on farms. Others come from homes where the parents are employed by railroads, small machine shops, and the larger factories in Ohio, and Erie, Pennsylvania, (2) A small segment of the community are itinerant, but family mobility for the most part is static, (3) Generally, the community is supportive of the school district. However, the teacher strike of September, 1977 did affect the school-community relationship, (4) Unemployment is generally higher in the district than in the rest of the county, (5) Real estate taxes have increased 112.5% in the last seven school years, (6) Student enrollment is stable. Current enrollment is below rated capacity, (7) There is a parent advisory committee for each school building, (8) The school board is involved in curricular decisions. All modifications and/or changes are approved by the board, (9) The school board is generally supportive of the district's administration, (10) The district's rating policy was developed cooperatively by the professional staff and administration and adopted by the school board, (11) The professional staff has extensive committee involvement in discipline, inservice, curriculum, and athletics, (12) The decision-making process is hierarchial, with most decisions being made administratively, (13) Although there are standing curriculum committees district-wide, there are no building level curriculum committees, and (14) Inservice education is conducted through the office of the superintendent with suggestions from principals and staff members. These curricular conditions are reflected by degrees throughout the problem solving process and knowledge utilization described in this case study. They underscore the success of the PSIP project.

1. School District, "Courses of Study for Reading," 1974.

Building Level Site

Elementary School Site

Constructed 1968	Type of Construction: One story brick
Additions 1970	
	Pupils Enrolled 850
Grades Housed K-6	Capacity 984
Number of Classrooms . . .32	
	Facilities other than classrooms:
Water . . . . . .Borough	
Sewage . . . . . .Borough	Library
	Double Multi-Purpose Room
Area 31.5A	Cafeteria
Environment . . . . . .Good	Music Room
Physical Features . . . . .Level-good drainage	Art Room
	Large Instruction Room
	Health & Administrative Suites
	Facilities & Seminar Room

The site is a self-contained building which serves an approximate population of 850 elementary students and a staff of 35 teachers. There is also a full-time principal, an elementary guidance counselor, and a part-time librarian. Grouping is heterogeneously arranged although the areas of mathematics and reading K-4 are self-contained and homogeneously grouped while Grades 5-6 are departmentalized, but also grouped homogeneously. The number of pupils per grade is approximately 110-120. The school's instructional program includes: reading, mathematics, penmanship, social studies, science, English, art, and music. The classroom teachers are assisted by four teacher aides.

Grades 1-3 spend approximately 7 1/2 hours on reading and 2 1/2 hours per week on mathematics. Grades 4-6 spend approximately 5 hours per week on reading and 2 1/2 hours per week on mathematics. The basal reader is the Economy Series while in mathematics, Grades 1-3 use the Addison Wesley Series and Grades 4-6 use the Holt, Rinehart and Winston Series. There are approximately 6000 books in the elementary library for all grades and a variety of subject matter in all interest categories. The testing program includes the use of standardized tests such as the Stanford Achievement, teacher-made tests, and the recent EQA.

Local Action Team

The LAT consists of seven professionals which includes two reading specialists and five elementary level classroom teachers. The building principal did not participate. (His absence throughout the project was quite noticeable and raised a serious question of whether the process would succeed.) The LAT coordinator was one of the reading specialists who was selected through a consensus of agreement among the LAT members. It was stated that, "She had more time to devote to coordinating the project and, "She has a good relationship with the Superintendent." (The LAT Coordinator, in reality, filled the administrative gap caused by the building principal's unwillingness to "get involved.")

This team of dedicated teachers expressed a desire to improve their instructional programs and to benefit their students. Prior to the project, they taught in self-contained classrooms without a systematic approach to problem-solving. The curricular conditions of the district and the site inhibited a cooperative approach to curriculum planning. There is no common planning time. There is no team teaching. There is no precedent for innovation. The school atmosphere is restrained, routinized, and allows little deviation from the security of traditional education.

SITE CASE STUDY
PART II

PSIP ACTIVITIES AT SCHOOL 5056

A. Entry/Initiation Phase

School districts from IU #5 were selected primarily on the basis of the severity of their problems in the area of basic skills. Individual elementary schools were identified within school districts on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The school's math and verbal percentile scores as measured by EQA
2. The relationship between the school's actual math and verbal scores on EQA and its predicted scores.
3. The discrepancy between the school's percentage of students falling in the lowest two quintiles and the state's percentage on those quintile.

Pennsylvania's EQA focuses on individual school buildings as the unit of measurement, rather than individual students.

There are three major activities during the PSIP Entry/Initiation Phase. First, a general overview meeting of the central office administrative teams from all of the participating school districts is held at the intermediate unit office. An orientation session is then presented by the PSIP team at the school site for the entire faculty. The site orientation session is followed by an on-site visit by the PSIP School Assistance Team (SAT) who gathers information about the general climate of each school. This visitation is termed a Pulse Session where the SAT virtually does "take the pulse" of the school.

General Overview Meeting

An administrative team from the district attended a general overview meeting on August 23, 1976 at the Intermediate Unit #5 building. Other administrative teams from local school districts were in attendance. They had been identified as possible PSIP sites through state assessment data in the basic skills areas of Reading and Mathematics and on the basis of a history of cooperation in IU #5 activities. The expected outcome was that the district administrators would gain a basic understanding of PSIP, clarification of the roles, and a commitment to the project's goals and objectives. At the conclusion of the meeting, the district's administrative team expressed a serious interest in the project. Immediate participation was delayed until the late spring of 1977.

On-Site Orientation Session

On May 16, 1977, the first orientation meeting was held at the school site. The purpose of the session was to acquaint the district administrators, principal, and teachers with the goals and objectives of PSIP. The session's outline included the following:

Workshop Outline

Local Action Team - Chief function

1. Decision making
2. Planning
3. Data gathering

School Assistance Team - Chief function

1. Provide structures and procedures
2. Serve as resources to the LAT

Reasons for a Needs Assessment step is to focus on an important area for improvement; not to tackle the improvement of every aspect:

a. Need to focus efforts and resources
b. Selection of a topic/grade level
c. Narrowing the focus of effort to the most important, most critical, or the area of greatest need.

General Sequence of Events:

Orientation	SAT/LAT
Assessing Student Needs	SAT/LAT
Assessing Program Needs	SAT/LAT
Knowledge Consolidation	SAT
Selection	SAT/LAT
Implementation	LAT

Research Utilizing Problem Solving Program - RUPS

Definition of a problem: a discrepancy between the way things are and the way someone else wants them to be.

The second meeting of the Entry/Initiation Phase was held on May 17, 1977 at the school site. Present were nine teachers (potential LAT members), the Linker, and a representative from LRDC. The meeting was held in the school library. The purpose of the meeting was to respond to questions that might have arisen from the original orientation and the printed material previously received.

The Linker reviewed the overall goals of PSIP, activities of the LAT, how time is provided for the work to be done, how the agencies are organized into work teams, and the work of the teams. This was done with the use of overhead slides. The teachers were somewhat confused as to what their respective roles would be, how long they would be involved, and how they would benefit.

The Linker explained that it was a group process. The area for study would be a group decision as all other decisions would be. The project was funded for the next eighteen months, and it should be a good learning experience for all participants. Time ran out before an in-depth type of discussion could take place. Again, "time" required short cuts which later on may result in misunderstandings and dissatisfaction. (This meeting was followed by a letter from the Linker).

A teacher strike delayed the next session of the Entry/Initiation Phase until October 11, 1977. In attendance were the principal, two reading specialists, five teachers and the Linker. The purpose of the meeting was to update the teachers on the project's objectives and plan the activities for the school year. The teachers had been on strike for three weeks.

Several teachers voiced opposition to being involved at this time. Comments were: "too much paperwork," "everytime they have been involved in these types of programs, nothing happens," "too much time out of class." One teacher felt that if they could be given a product they could try it out,without going through all the steps and wasting time. Another said she knew her needs and didn't feel this type of program would help. The teachers felt that they were never involved in the decision-making, i.e., the selection of reading over math.

On the positive side, several teachers indicated they would like to get started on the project activities. A suggestion was made that if a teacher from another school presently involved in PSIP could talk with the teachers, it might further clarify the project and answer the concerns of the teachers. The Linker scheduled a meeting for October 10, 1977 for the potential LAT with the LAT coordinator from another district's site.

The follow-up meeting was held on October 19, 1977 at the school site. Present were one reading specialist, five teachers, the Linker, and the other district LAT coordinator. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the potential LAT members an opportunity to interact with the outside LAT coordinator. The teachers asked questions about the amount of time, paperwork, advantages and disadvantages and types of activities they would specifically be involved in during the school year. The coordinator resonded to the teachers' concerns and it was felt she had clarified some of the misunderstandings the teachers had on the project.

The teachers agreed to begin the project activities and would contact representatives from the first and sixth grades. A "pulse" session or visitation by the SAT was to be scheduled through the building principal. A meeting with the building principal was scheduled for October 24, 1977 to plan the visitation.

The Pulse Session

The Pulse Session, an on-site visitation by the SAT, was held on November 9, 1977. Representatives of PDE, LRDC, and RISE conducted the session. Two reading teachers and five teachers were involved in the process. The purpose of the visit was to visit classrooms and interview teachers. A questionnaire, developed by LRDC, was utilized by the SAT.[1]

Summary of School Site 5056 Pulse Session

1. How many years of teaching? This school/this district?
   The teachers as a group are experienced, most have been teaching five years or more.

2. Do you have any questions about PSIP?
   Most teachers wondered what PSIP would expect them to do. Several teachers expressed a desire that it would help the kindergarten screening, use of co-basal series in the classrooms and possibly improve reading comprehension if these are identified as the problems.

3. Are you reasonably satisfied with the students' achievement at the end of your grade level?
   Several teachers felt that 50% of the students couldn't read well to cope with the content area materials. The reading tests have shown that 25% of the students have reading problems, the students are under-achieving. One teacher felt that since the inception of the remedial reading teacher, and learning disability teacher, the poorer children have improved. It was also expressed that the students' responses are apparently the key resource of information on what they had last year.

1. See Appendix I.

4. What aspects of the program do you feel need strengthened?
There could be more interaction between grade levels, more parent involvement and additional consumable supplies. A problem of insufficient variety of supplemental materials was also expressed.

5. Are you observed on a regular basis?
Yes, most teachers indicated that they were observed at least twice per year.

6. Is there a basic course of study? With specific objectives?
The course of studies is the basal reader and an elementary course of study which includes reading goals, objectives, and activities. Most teachers do not follow the course of study. The Economy Series and Ginn Series are used and their scope and sequence is followed by most teachers.

7. How is achievement measured?
EQA, standardized tests, teacher-made tests. Several teachers indicated they didn't know which are standardized tests and make little use of the tests that are given.

8. Basically, how would you describe the student body?
Most teachers describe the student body as well disciplined and highly motivated. Parental pressure was a concern when there was discipline problems with the students.

9. What is your teaching load?
Grade one - four were self-contained, grades five and six were departmentalized. The average class size was approximately 28 students.

10. Are there curriculum committees?
There are no formally organized curriculum committees. Although it was pointed out that four second grade teachers have gotten together this year to plan one common unit/month (Animals, Thanksgiving). The strategy includes jointly picking forty books from the library, rotate ten to each room on a weekly basis. Also, teachers exchange classes, i.e., each one took a subset of an animal unit, taught to all classes, no official leader, principal is aware through lesson plans, but no comment on effort.

11. What is your basic text?
The Economy Series is the basic text, and most teachers felt it was suitable for most of the children.

12. What supplementary materials are available:
Most teachers felt there were satisfactory amounts of supplementary materials. Examples were individual packets, library books and materials for the higher level students.

13. Do you have much contact with parents?
There was no agreement among teachers as to the amount of contact with parents. There is an open house, and the principal holds conferences with parents, no teachers are present. There are no regularly scheduled conferences unless requested by the parents.

14. What use do you make of standardized tests?
Several teachers use the results to compare scores from last year and this year to make students aware of their progress. Some teachers felt the series' tests were more helpful and accurate.

15. Do you often request the services of the guidance department?
The majority of teachers utilized the guidance department when dealing with difficult children and children with emotional problems.

16. How can a project such as PSIP be of greatest assistance to you as a teacher? Department?
It may help us identify what are some of the weaknesses in the reading program and attempt to identify alternative solutions to the problem.

17. How do you deal with individual differences?
The majority of teachers group their children, some teachers have as many as five groups. Utilize varied levels of materials, regroup children as they improve.

18. Do you think enough time has been scheduled to adequately teach your objectives?
The majority of teachers felt there was enough time to teach the objectives in reading, although it was mentioned that there could be more preparation time.

The reading teachers at the site indicated that there are about 25% of the students in the remedial reading program. Teachers' referrals plus SAT scores and IRI are used to identify the students. In grades 1,2,3 the students have to be six months below grade level, and in grades 4,5,6 the students have to be one year below grade level.

One of the problems is the children's background, low SEC rural poor. Students have 1/2 hour every day in remedial reading at the lower primary level, the intermediate students have 90 minutes per week. [illegible] teachers work with the classroom teachers and provide a checklist that goes home with the students. Hopefully, from PSIP they expect to get anything that will help the students. Kindergarten screening, co-basals in the classrooms and work on comprehension.

B. Needs Identification Phase

There are three major activities in the Needs Identification Phase of PSIP: (1) Introduction to Needs Identification, (2) Student Needs Analysis, and (3) Program Analysis. Each major activity makes a specific contribution to the PSIP Knowledge Consolidation and PSIP Selection of Outcomes processes. The Introduction to Needs Analysis provides a general statement of a specific problem area; this problem statement provides the PSIP agencies involved in the Knowledge Search and Consolidation processes with data necessary to initiate a definition of criteria relative to the site's specific area of concern. The Student Needs Analysis activities result in a detailed definition of the area of need for a specific student population within a basic skills curriculum. Again, the Knowledge Consolidation unit uses the Student Needs Definition to further refine the pool of possible R & D outcomes applicable to the problem identified by the site. The Program Analysis provides an in-depth description of the current school curricula in a selected skills area. This detailed description also contributes to the criteria used by the Knowledge Consolidation component to identify an appropriate listing or catalog of R & D outcomes to be submitted to the LAT during the Selection phase of PSIP.

Introduction to Needs Analysis

The first meeting of the Needs Identification Phase was held at the IU #5 building on December 15, 1977. In attendance were the LAT (consisting of two reading teachers and six elementary teachers) and the Linker. The purpose of the meeting was to implement Needs Assessment I phase of the project. The Linker began the meeting by reviewing the PSIP process, and specifically the Student Needs Assessment activities. The pulse report was presented to the teachers and the following are their responses to the report. The comments were part of a general discussion and do not necessarily commit the team to concentrate on any of the items:

1. "Test results are not readily available when needed. It is difficult for teachers to utilize the data in planning."
2. "When students return from the L.D. class to the regular classroom, they have difficulty working alone and therefore fall behind."
3. "Teachers felt that common planning time would allow them to share instructional techniques and common areas of concern."
4. "There was concern expressed for the problem of passing children who do not successfully achieve grade level work (overall). Is there a greater need for communications between the guidance department, administration, and classroom teachers?"
5. "It was felt students have difficulty in not being able to read and comprehend in the content areas."
6. "It was felt that additional preparation time is not adequate. The Linker indicated this type of concern relates more to contractual agreements between the administration and teachers and is not within the realm of PSIP."
7. "Teachers wondered whether there could be a change in the testing format grades 1-6?"
8. "The Stanford Achievement tests might be reviewed over a period of years to indicate a clearer picture of trends in student achievement."
9. "The teachers felt that there could be the possibility of a checklist of students' reading skills but were concerned it may be threatening to some teachers."

10. "Many of the tests are not part of the present reading system and management materials were not available."
11. "It was felt that some of the content area textbooks are above the student's grade level."
12. "It was indicated that there was a lack of the Economy system's materials in fourth and fifth grade levels and supplemental materials in all grade levels."

Following the discussion on the Pulse visit, the Linker shared the Stanford Achievement tests analyzed by LRDC. Although there was little data available, what was presented indicated that student interest and achievement began to drop off after third grade.

At this point, the Linker introduced to the teachers a model for developing a general needs statement which included three questions to be developed:

1. Who is affected?
2. What kind of need is it?
3. What are the goals for improvement?

The teachers were divided into two groups and began "brainstorming" ideas on what they felt their greatest need may be within the reading program. After lunch, each group reported on their discussion and after several rewrites, developed a general needs statement.[1] The statement is to be shared with other faculty members for their reaction.

The Linker reviewed with the teachers several items relating to the general needs statement and pointed out that the intent of PSIP was to focus in on the most critical of the identified needs. Also, it was pointed out that many areas that we discussed as a group have within them constraints which may prevent the group from moving in a particular area.

The group as a whole felt that the day's activities were worthwhile and that it gave the teachers an opportunity to exchange ideas across grade levels and hopefully will provide an opportunity to analyze the present reading curriculum.

A specific date was not set for the next meeting, but the group felt it should meet as a whole and not as subcommittees. The reading teacher agreed to act as the LAT coordinator and all correspondence will be done through her. A summary will be sent to the building principal and both he and the guidance counselor will be encouraged to attend the next meeting, hopefully sometime during the second or third week of January.

Linker Memo of January 5, 1978

The Needs Assessment I session was held on 12/15/77, the general needs statement was completed. The Needs Assessment II session is scheduled for 1/12/78.

Student Needs Analysis

The second meeting of the Needs Assessment phase was held on January 17, 1978. Attending were six teachers, two reading teachers, the Linker, and the representative from LRDC. The purpose of the meeting was to begin the Needs Assessment II activities, setting desired and current student performances. The Linker reviewed the first needs assessment meeting held on 12/15/77. The LAT was asked to review the general needs

1. See Appendix II .

statement to see if there were any changes, in particular, from other teachers within the school. The teachers indicated that the needs assessment statement was valid. At this point, the total needs assessment activities were reviewed as well as the agenda for the day.

The LAT discussed the present materials being used at the various grade levels. The Economy series is the basal reader for K-6. This is the first year for the 6th grade to use the series and the 6th grade teachers are adjusting to the program. It was pointed out by the LAT that the Economy series is followed very closely at 1st through 3rd grades with extensive structure and direction being given by the teacher. Although, at the 4th through 6th grades, the program is supplemented rather generously.

The Linker pointed out that the goals identified in the needs statement appear to be divided into two areas, student and teacher needs. The areas of student needs in terms of reading were placed in three categories:

1. Comprehension
   a. Literal
   b. Inferential
   c. Imagery

The current status of the students would be determined for literal comprehension by using Botel's Word Opposite test:

2. Vocabulary
   a. Word meaning
   b. Multiple meaning
   c. Context clues

Word meaning would be determined with Botel's Word Opposite test. Initially, attention would be focused on literal comprehension and work meaning. The Stanford Test results for the past six years would be used to determine if there have been any trends. The trends would represent current conditions, the LAT may desire to alter the trends. The last area the LAT may wish to study was the affective area:

3. Affective
   a. Self-concept
   b. Attitude toward reading

The LAT reviewed several types of reading attitude surveys and selected a survey presently available with the reading specialists (C.R.P.T. - Comprehensive Reading Plan Test). Revisions need to be made to the test to make it applicable to the primary grades. It was pointed out that one concern we should be aware of is the identification of the students not working up to their ability, that is, the students identified on the student needs statement.[1]

The IU will provide copies of the Botel to the LAT. This test will be used only by the LAT representatives grades 1-6. LRDC will work with the Stanford Achievement results to determine if the data will identify any specific trends. The principal will provide the summaries to the SAT. The Linker will be in contact with the LAT coordinator to develop a strategy for administering and scoring the tests.

---

1. See Appendix III.

The Linker reviewed the total needs assessment activities and pointed out that if the tests are given to attempt to provide current data, the LAT may meet to begin program analysis while the data is being collected, scored, and analyzed. The LAT did complete the first two columns of the desired student performance chart.[1] A tentative date was set for the next meeting; Wednesday, February 15, 1978.

Linker-Coordinator Meeting

The Linker met with the LAT coordinator on February 1, 1978. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with the LAT coordinator the student attitude test that will be administered to the 1-6 grade students. The teachers will identify student populations in their classrooms who they believe are not working up to their ability or grade level by checking the students' papers. The teachers on the LAT will administer the Boetel Word Opposite Test to their classes so that additional current data can be gathered. The test data will be compiled by the IU and will be presented at the 2/22/78 LAT-SAT meeting. The plans are to develop the students' desired and current performance charts based on some of the data.

The LAT is planning to attend a workshop in Pittsburgh, April 7, 1978, "Teaching The Reluctant Learner." One of the LAT's identified needs has been in the area of improving student motivation; hopefully this workshop will offer the teachers more insight into their concerns.

The next meeting of the LAT/SAT dealing with Needs Assessment was held on February 22, 1978. Present were six teachers, one reading teacher, the Linker, and the representative from LRDC. The purpose of the meeting was to analyze the current test data that was collected from the Boetel Word Opposite Test[2] and the CPRI Attitude Test.[3] The LAT was to work on the student performance charts both desired and current based on the test data. The Linker began the session by reviewing the minutes of the 1/17/78 meeting and discussing with the teachers the possibility of attending two workshops related to the PSIP activities, "Teaching The Reluctant Learner" on 4/7/78 and the SARI workshop on 4/6/78. The project will provide substitutes if the teachers are interested in attending.

The next task was to review with the LAT the needs analysis activities, specifically related to setting desired and current standards for the identified content areas:

1. Comprehension
2. Vocabulary
3. Affective

The first instrument that was reviewed was the Boetel Word Opposite Test administered by the LAT for their classrooms. After a brief discussion, the teachers felt that the results that were indicated were not necessarily useful for their purposes in measuring standards. The next instrument that was analyzed was the student attitude toward reading inventory. It was suggested to the LAT by the LRDC representative that after the survey is reviewed by each grade level, the teachers may want to identify 6-8 questions they feel are important relating to students' self-concept and attitude toward reading.

---

1. See Appendix III.
2. See Appendix IV.
3. See Appendix V.

The LAT was then presented with a design to follow on ranking the questions and gleaning student percentages and numbers directly related to each identified question.[1] The questions were grouped (++1+) (-1=) according to how the students responded. The LAT then proceeded to take the percentage of the numbers of students listed in the + and - columns to determine the percentage of students in each grade level who exhibited a poor self-concept. The student performance chart for self-concept indicated:[2]

The next area the LAT examined was the students' attitude toward reading. The next set of identified questions (#39,340,36) were identified and the percentage and number of students responding were gleaned from the data:

Attitude toward reading although considered by the LAT as an important factor, the data supported a more concentrated effort in the student self-concept area.[4] The LAT then discussed the need to analyze data for the cognitive areas. The only data available for these areas is the Stanford Achievement Tests over a period of years, possibly 1971 through 1977. This information will be supplied by the central office for the years 1971-74. The principal has supplied the data for the years 1975 through 1977. The LRDC representative will analyze the data for the purpose of identifying grade level scores for vocabulary, comprehension, language, word study skills, and spelling.

The Linker briefly explained the next activities that will take place including a very brief summary of Program Analysis. The LAT will receive a summary of the meeting and completed chart on the affective area, self-concept. There will be enough copies of the chart for the entire faculty. In addition, before the next meeting, a packet of materials on the program analysis phase of the project will be sent to the LAT for review. The next meeting is scheduled for 3/14/78, a half-day activity at the IU building.

Linker Memo of March 6, 1978

The lack of current student data has presented a problem in determining student standards. The LAT administered the CPRT Reading Attitude Inventory and the Boetel Word Opposite tests to grades 1-6. The needs analysis session on the results of these two tests was completed on February 22, 1978. The LAT, with assistance from the LRDC representative analyzed the test and determined students' current and desired standards for the self-concept area.

Analyzing Program Needs

The next meeting dealing with Needs Assessment has held on March 14, 1978 at the IU office. Attending were the two reading teachers, four teachers, the Linker, and the LRDC representative. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with the LAT the student performance in the cognitive area. In addition, the Program Analysis Phase of the project was to be presented to the LAT. The Linker reviewed the minutes of the last meeting and discussed with the group their plans to attend the SARI workshop on 4/6/78 and the Reluctant Learner Workshop on 4/7/78. The activities for the month were discussed.

The LRDC representative then discussed with the group the Stanford Achievement test results he had had an opportunity to analyze. The teachers were given summaries of

1. See Appendix VI.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

the data for the LAT to analyze.[1] He then explained and illustrated to the teachers how they could utilize the data available to determine current and desired student performances. The LAT will utilize the data and complete the charts by the first week in April.

It was pointed out that the EQA was given in March and that grades 1-6 will be tested in May with Stanford Achievement test. This data will be utilized to verify the student performance charts developed by the LAT.[2]

At this point, the IU Linker presented to the LAT the Program Analyses phase of the program. The LAT had received a packet of materials on Program Analysis before the meeting. The ten variables were defined and discussed with the LAT. The teachers decided on the following format for the method of gathering data and who the data was goint to be gathered from:

1. Structured interviews - LAT members and/or other grade level representatives.[3]
2. Questionnaires from other staff members.[4]
3. Principal and guidance counselor - interviewed.[5]

A copy of the definitions will be sent to the LAT coordinator to be distributed to the total staff. The interviews and questionnaires will be scheduled during the two weeks in April.

The next meeting of Needs Assessment was held on May 11, 1978 at the IU office. In attendance were five teachers, one reading teacher, the Linker, and representatives from PDE and LRDC. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Student Needs Charts and complete the Current Student Standards and then develop a detailed Student Needs Statement. The Linker reviewed the General Needs Statement and the Student Performance Charts completed to date. The task of the LAT was to determine current student standards of success. After a lengthy discussion with various methodologies presented, the LAT decided to complete the task after the afternoon session following the presentation of the program analysis data and Introduction to Selection which would be done jointly with another LAT from a neighboring school district.

The PSIP Director (PDE) led the discussion on how the LATs might want to analyze the Program Analysis Report data based on the constructs and ten classroom variables. The task for the LAT was to develop one-liners or comments on each response to the questionnaire or interview so that that information could be developed into a detailed Program Needs Statement.

The Linker then introduced Selection and discussed with the two LATs the rationale for the selection process and the procedure that each team will follow as they complete the selection process. The PSIP "Givens" and "Assumptions" were discussed and it was pointed out that the site specified ground rules and criteria will be discussed separately with each LAT at the next meeting. The teachers then received a packet of R & D outcomes abstracts so as to provide them a flavor of what types of materials will be analyzed during the selection process.

The LAT then met again and the LRDC representative outlined a strategy on how they could arrive at their desired and current student performance standards utilizing the

---

1. See Appendix VII.
2. See Appendix VIII.
3. See Appendix IX.
4. Ibid.
5. See Appendix X.

April, 1977 Stanford Achievement data. The LAT coordinator and the Linker will meet on May 18, 1978 to complete the charts both in the broad ones and subcategories from the data on the Stanford Achievement. The next full LAT/SAT meeting is scheduled for May 23, 1978 at the site. At this meeting, the Student Performance Charts will be completed and discrepancies will be developed. In addition, the detailed Student Needs Statement will be completed and the Program Analysis Data will be reviewed. The LAT has already developed, through the use of the CPRT Attitude Test, the desired and current student performance standards dealing with the student's self-concept.

Linker Memo of May 5, 1978

The Program Analysis interviews and questionnaires were completed in April. A Program Analysis Report was presented to the LAT on May 11, 1978. A completed Program Analysis Report [1] will be presented on May 23, 1978. The Student Needs Analysis[2] will also be completed at that time. Program Selection was introduced on May 11, 1978. The school district will be in session until June 29th so plans are to complete selection in June and plan for implementation in September, 1978.

The next meeting of Needs Assessment was held on May 23, 1978 at the site. In attendance were two reading teachers, six teachers, the Linker and the representative from LRDC. The purpose of the meeting was to complete the Student Needs Analysis including desired and current student performances, and identifying the discrepancies. In addition, the LAT reviewed the Program Analysis Report and developed one-line statements in the areas identified by the teachers.

The Linker and the LRDC representative worked with the teachers as they developed their desired and current performances. There did not appear to be any major area of concerns under vocabulary and comprehension, although it was indicated that there is a definite decrease in the number of students that fall within the 7-8-9 stanine from the first three grades to grades 4,5, and 6. The area of self-concept was indicated as an area the teachers wanted to concentrate and attempt to identify an R & D outcome. Information on the PATL program was given to the teachers for their review.

The teachers completed their detailed student needs statement.[3] The Linker and the LAT coordinator will meet on June 2, 1978 to summarize the Needs Assessment phase of the project. The next LAT/SAT meeting will be on June 8, 1978 at the IU building. The purpose of the meeting will be to review the summary of the needs analysis, establish ground rules and criteria for selection, and review R & D outcomes. It was suggested that some members may want to attend the ILA training sessions to be held in another school district on June 14 and 15, 1978. This will be discussed at the June 8, 1978 meeting.

1. See Appendix XI.
2. See Appendix XII.
3. See Appendix XIII.

C. Selection Phase

Selection provides the school staff an opportunity to screen and identify intervention programs and strategies based on locally developed site criteria. Local conditions serve as a vital input in the determination of the criteria to be used in selection. The LAT and SAT review the information gathered during the knowledge consolidation effort using the standards developed through needs definition. The selection process involves: (1) developing final selection criteria related to local school conditions, (2) screening possible educational practices using LAT standards,[1] and (3) producing a general plan for implementing the educational practices selected.

As teachers move through the selection process they participate in several screenings. This objective has been reached after the LAT has screened many R & D outcomes and narrowed the list to approximately five alternatives. Additional information is obtained regarding the remaining list of alternatives. After a more intensive review by the LAT, a final selection is made. At this point, implementation planning begins.

Introduction to Selection

Although the Selection Process Phase had been introduced at a previous meeting of May 11, 1978, the first meeting dedicated to beginning this phase was held on June 18, 1978 at the IU building. Attending were two reading teachers, four teachers, the Linker and a representative of RISE. The purpose of the meeting was to complete the needs analysis phase of the project and move the teachers into the selection process by introducing selection, developing selection criteria,[2] setting ground rules, and reviewing R & D outcome abstracts. The Linker reviewed with the LAT, the minutes of the last meeting of May 23, 1978, the student performance charts, and the detailed student needs statement. The next activity was to review the performance analysis one-liners as well as an outside consultant's analysis of the program. Following a discussion by the LAT, the detailed program student needs statement was developed by the teachers.[3]

The next activity was to summarize with the LAT the needs analysis portion of the process and move into the Introduction to Selection. Modules 12, 13, and 14 were reviewed with the LAT. These were introduced to the teachers on May 11, 1978. The LAT agreed to the following ground rules:

1. Decisions will be made by consensus of the LAT.
2. Activities will be coordinated and if the situation arises there will be a division of labor as the LAT reviews the R & D outcomes.
3. The rules can be altered to meet given situations.
4. The classroom teachers on the LAT will pilot the final selection outcomes in six classrooms.
5. One reading teacher responsible for grades 1,2,3 and a second reading teacher responsible for grades 4.5.6.

The LAT then responded to the following questions relating to the district's existing selection practice and policy:

---

1. See Appendix XIV.
2. Ibid.
3. See Appendix XIII.

1. Who currently decides what curriculum will be used?
   Teachers and administrators.
2. How often is the curriculum changed?
   Slow process, depending on subject area.
3. Who decides on the topics of in-service for teachers?
   Teachers and administration.
4. How is in-service related to improvement efforts?
   It is not always related to improvement efforts, not coordinated.
5. How are needs assessed for curriculum change?
   Test results, outdated books.

The RISE representative then began to work with the LAT on the development of the selection criteria. Following agreement on the criteria, RISE then worked with the LAT on reviewing the R & D outcome abstracts. Samples of the outcomes were provided to the teachers to work with during the next two weeks. The next LAT/SAT meeting will be June 26, 1978 at the site. The purpose of the meeting will be to:

1. Continue selection process.
2. Attempt to identify possible resource people for PATL and SARI.
3. Report from LAT members who attend June 14, 1978 ILA Awareness Workshop.
4. Develop tentative plans for implementation.
5. Wrap-up PSIP activities for the 1977-78 school year.
6. Plan a possible LAT/SAT meeting in August or early September.
7. Plan for possible site visitations for September.

Several recommendations were made for the 1978-79 school year:

1. Request an item analysis of the SAT on grades 3-5 from the 1978 Spring testing.
2. The LAT will attempt to identify an R & D outcome in both the cognitive and affective areas.
3. The following needs were prioritized:
   a. self-concept
   b. management system
   c. reading/LA-written and oral expression
   d. basal related and supplementary materials and their effect in use.
   e. the testing program should relate to the reading program.

Second Selection Session

The second meeting of the Selection Phase was held at the site on June 26, 1978. Attending were the two reading teachers, five teachers, a SARI consultant, and the Linker. The purpose of the meeting was to continue the selection process with the LAT. The Linker reviewed the minutes of the June 18, 1978 meeting and discussed the importance of the selection criteria developed by the teachers as they review the R & D outcomes. The LAT members who attended the ILA awareness session reported to the total LAT. It may be a program that is considered at a later date.

The next activity was a presentation by a SARI consultant, who has used the program for the past three years in his classroom. The key points that were identified by the consultant in relationship to the use of the program by the teachers were:

1. It will provide continuity in the reading program.
2. It is a flexible program.
3. It provides the teachers with accountability or the three major reading skills: vocabulary, word analysis, and comprehension.
4. It provides specific information on skill areas.
5. It provides sequence.
6. It can be integrated into the present basal reading series.

The LAT discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the SARI program and indicated a great amount of interest in adopting the program. The cost of installing the program on a pilot basis would be approximately:

1. Reading Activities 0.0-7.0, 8.0-12.0
   Complete SARI Activity Kits . . . . . $ 95.00
2. SARI Binder . . . . . $ 25.00
   $120.00 per teacher
3. Six teachers piloting the program at a total cost of $720.00.

The alternative would be to order the minimum materials for implementation:

1. Binders
2. Profile Charts
3. Placement Tests
4. Cross Reference for the Economy Basal Series
   (Cost of above to be determined)

The consultant pointed out that in order to implement the basic SARI program, three steps would occur:

1. Administer placement tests to the entire class.
2. Record on profile charts.
3. Develop your approach from the profile chart to teach skills.

The Linker reviewed with the LAT the next steps as the teachers proceed through the selection process:

1. Continue to review R & D outcomes on site, including SARI, in relationship to the selection criteria.
2. Plan and develop specific recommendations for the administration. LAT coordinator will be contacted on a definite date for the administration and a time-line will be developed.
3. Plan a possible meeting in August to complete the selection process and begin planning for implementation based on the following critical areas:
   a. Program timing and budgeting.
   b. Staff assignment, orientation, and training
   c. Materials, equipment, and facilities
   d. Student scheduling

The Linker will contact the superintendent for a meeting with the LAT coordinator to present the recommendations. Phi Delta Kappan will be contacted as a possible consultant if the teachers decide to utilize the SARI program. Implementation will be scheduled for late September or October. The LAT may schedule a site visitation to the Claysburg-Kimmel School District to review the PATL Program. The teachers have concluded that the three major areas that they will concentrate on will be the management system, self-concept, and written and oral expression.

Linker Memo of July 17, 1978

The last LAT/SAT was held on June 26, 1978. At that time the teachers continued to review the R & D outcomes. A classroom teacher from Cambridge Springs Elementary School presented the SARI program to the LAT. A meeting was held with the superintendent on July 12, 1978 to present a progress report to the district. Both the LAT coordinator and I made the presentation. You will be receiving a copy of the report and recommendation within the next two weeks. The next LAT/SAT meeting is being scheduled for some time during the week of August 21st. The tentative plan is to complete the selection process in September with one or two site visitations planned. The implementation plan will be developed in October and the six classroom teachers on the LAT will pilot the implementation in grades 1-6.

Third Selection Session

The third meeting of the Selection Phase was held on August 23, 1978 at the IU office. Attending were two reading teachers, four teachers and the Linker. The purpose of the meeting was to review and update the LAT's activities that were completed at the end of the 1977-78 school year. The Intermediate Unit Coordinator (Linker) discussed with the teachers the results of the report to the superintendent.

1. The superintendent agreed to obtain the Stanford Achievement Test Item Analysis for grades 3 and 5 from the June 1978 scores.
2. The teachers' priorities were agreed upon, student self-concept, a reading management system and a reading and language arts program concentrating on written and oral expression.
3. The selection and implementation of a program would be piloted in six classrooms.

The LAT continued to express an interest in the following programs: ILA, PATL, and SARI. The teachers requested the Linker set visitations for sometime in September, preferrably during the week of September 11 or 18. Two teams were established for visitations; Pine Grove - PATL and Claysburg -Kimmel - ILA. The teachers also indicated an interest in pursuing the possibility of implementing the SARI program on a pilot basis. The Phi Delta Kappa consultant will be contacted on the feasibility of providing training during the week of September 25. Before the arrangements can be made, the Linker is to contact the superintendent to see if the district will support financially the cost of piloting the program in six classrooms.

The Linker then reviewed with the teachers the activities that will take place during implementation, planning, and installation. The major emphasis in planning would be:

1. Program timing and budgeting.
2. Staff assignment, orientation, and training
3. Materials, equipment, and facilities.
4. Student scheduling and instructional procedures.

It was suggested that before implementation, the teachers should present to the faculty a program report and outline the activities they will be involved in during the school year.

The Stanford Achievement Tests, Item Analysis for the third and fifth grade was dis-

tributed to the teachers. The Teachers reviewed the results and discussed how they should be shared with the other teachers. The LAT members representing the two grade levels would share with the other grade level teachers on the teacher in-service day, August 29.

A meeting was not scheduled, the LAT coordinator and the Linker will meet with the superintendent to discuss the district's financial commitment to implement SARI, ILA, and PATL.

Linker Memo of September 1, 1978

A LAT meeting was held on 8/23/78 for the purpose of developing plans for the 1978-79 school year. The LAT made plans for a series of visitations to be held during September and October for the ILA and PATL programs. It is planned to have the PATL program piloted in six classrooms and the SARI program, if approved by the administration, to be piloted in the same six classrooms. The Linker met with the building principal on 8/25/78 to discuss the LAT's recommendations. The principal agreed to present the recommendations to the superintendent during the first week of September and contact the LAT on the superintendent's decision.

D. Implementation Phase

A major objective of the Implementation Phase is reached when an implementation plan is developed for the new intervention strategy. The implementation plan is then presented to the appropriate school district decision-makers for approval and acceptance. Once this is accomplished, installation of program activities are initiated. Continual evaluation and monitoring activities occur with the inception of new program activities. Results from the formative and summative evaluation activities are reviewed at scheduled time periods by decision-makers. If the intervention is found successful, then a district may decide to expand its impact beyond the site school. Formal PSIP assistance is terminated at this point, but hopefully, by participating in the process, teachers' skills in curriculum analysis have been refined and could be transferred to other district curricular activities.

First Implementation Session

Although implementation concepts had been introduced during the selection phase and some overlap of selection process existed, the first major Implementation Session was held on October 11, 1978 at the site. Attending were the two reading teachers, five teachers and the Linker. The purpose of the meeting was to review with the LAT the teacher visitation to the Pine Grove School District to view the PATL program. The teachers that took part in the visitation all agreed that the program was excellent and felt it was the one the teachers feel should be implemented at their school. The Linker had already discussed the program with the superintendent and it appeared to have his support, programistically and financially. Four teachers will attend the PATL program in Home Center, Pennsylvania on October 16, 17, 18, 1978. The self-concept and motivation (active involvement) will be the two areas the teachers will adapt.

Two teachers per grade level, one LAT member and one non-member will implement the program. The training for the teachers will take place during the month of November. The LAT is planning to implement programs in December or January depending upon the school schedule.

The Linker will be working with the entire faculty with the Economy Management System that will be utilized in lieu of the SARI System. The next LAT/SAT meeting is planned for November 8, 1978 at the school site. The purpose of the meeting will be to develop the implementation plan and begin to develop the evaluation plan. More specific details will be explored relative to the staff training in the PATL Program. The building principal will work with the LAT at the November 8th meeting so that building and faculty considerations are discussed relative to the implementation plan.

Three teachers are planning a visitation to Claysburg/Kimmel School District to view the ILA program. Final plans will be made through the Linker.

Linker Memo of October 23, 1978

The Linker met with the LAT coordinator and building principal on 9/18/78 and 10/11/78 to finalize plans for the PATL visitation and training. Three teachers attended the training 10/16/78 at Homer City. An LAT/SAT meeting is scheduled for 10/8/78 to develop the PATL implementation and evaluation plan and also to develop a strategy for training additional teachers. The PATL program will be implemented at grade levels 1-6, two teachers per grade level.

Second Implementation Session

The second Implementation Session was held on November 8, 1978 at the school site. In attendance were the superintendent, two reading teachers, six teachers, one teacher and one principal from another elementary school, representatives from RBS, LRDC, PDE, and the Linker. The purpose of the session was to plan strategies for the implementation of the PATL program. The agenda was:

I. Review the 10/11/78 LAT meeting.
PUIP update of activities.

II. Discussion of the PATL Program

1. Self-concept - motivation (active involvement)
2. PATL training - 10/16-17-18/78.
3. Financial projections for PATL.
4. PATL district training planning plan.
5. Building and district support.

III. Planning for implementation of PATL

a. Program timing and budgeting.
b. Staff assignment, orientation, training.
c. Materials, equipment, and facilities.
d. Student scheduling and instructional procedures.

IV. Planning for evaluation

V. Wrap-up Summary - plans for next activity

The Linker reviewed with the LAT the summary from October 10th LAT meeting. The plans for the PATL training were made at that meeting. The teachers who went on the PATL visitation reported to the whole LAT and guests their perceptions of the visit. The teachers felt that the program was operating smoothly and were quite impressed with the enthusiasm of the Pine Grove teachers that were implementing the PATL program.

Following the discussion on the PATL visitation, the LAT members who attended the PATL training on October 16-18, 1978 shared their experiences with the group. The LAT is planning to adopt the self-concept kit during the second semester of the 1978-79 year. The self concept area was identified as the top priority during the needs assessment phase of the process. There will be two persons per grade level K-6 at the main site and two teachers at the second grade level at a seoond elementary school site within the district, who will pilot the PATL program.

The implementation plan will include an overview of PATL for the total faculty of each school. Training of teachers will take place in December so that the program can begin implementation in January. The trainers will include the two reading teachers, another teacher from the other elementary site, and the Linker. A planning session is scheduled for November 30 at the Intermediate Unit. At this meeting the training schedule will be developed for the pilot teachers.

The implementation plan guidelines were presented to the LAT. The teachers worked in two groups to respond to a series of questions relating to the major components o implementation:[1]

1. See Appendix XV.

1. Program timing and budgeting.
2. Staff assignment, orientation, training.
3. Materials, equipment and facilities.
4. Student scheduling and instructional procedures.

The training for the K-6 pilot teachers will take place December 7 and 8 and one day in January. A notice will be sent to the parents of the children who will be involved in the PATL program. A budget was developed and included as part of the implementation plan.[1]

The next activity was a discussion of the evaluation plan for the PATL program. The following list of questions was developed as a "First Draft" of what may be included in the final evaluation plan:

1. Is the program being implemented as it was intended? What are some of the indicators?
2. Is the program accomplishing what the teachers wanted it to do?
3. Was the training sufficient enough to allow for a smooth transition to implementation?
4. Is the program successful enough to warrent expansion to other classrooms?
5. Has there been interest generated among other teachers?
6. Did the teachers complete the activities related to the behavioral objectives?
7. What has been the impact on teacher attitudes?
8. Is the time for the kit advisor activities realistic?
9. Are the materials accessible? storage? filing? inventory?
10. How often did the program need to be modified?
11. How appropriate are the materials? activities?
12. How much time is required to implement the program?
13. Has the program increased communication between teachers and students? teacher to teacher?

The LAT will receive a copy of the above questions for their review and reaction. The training team on 11/30/78 will provide additional input into the evaluation plan. The schedule of activities for the implementation of PATL is:

1. Trainers meeting to develop a specific training schedule 11/30/78.
2. Overview will be presented to both faculties.
3. A notice will be sent to parents whose children are involved in PATL.
4. The teachers will attend training sessions on December 7 and 8.
5. A follow-up meeting is scheduled for early January and implementation will begin following this meeting.
6. The evaluation plan will include a timeline as follows:

PATL TIMELINE

11/30/78 - meeting of trainers to plan training, assignments, schedules, ordering materials.
12/11/78 - orientation of second site's faculty.
12/7-8/78- one day training for each participating teacher.
1/79 - final orientation and training for participating teachers.
1/79 - week of January 15 actual implementation begins.
3/79 - first week of March progress evaluation Linker, kit advisor

1. See Appendix XV.

5/79 - first week in May - progress evaluation - development of program recommendations for the district.

7. The district will support the costs of PATL materials and substitutes for the training.

There is no LAT/SAT meeting scheduled until after the training and implementation of PATL. The Linker will develop an in-service course for credit for the teachers involved.

Linker Memo of 11/15/78

The LAT/SAT meeting was held on 11/8/78 at the site. The superintendent attended so as to provide the needed district support to the implementation of PATL. The implementation plan was developed as well as the first draft of the evaluation questions. The LAT coordinator and two LAT members will meet at the Intermediate Unit to develop the training schedule for PATL. The training will take place on 12/7-8/78 and the program will be implemented during the month of January. An overview of PSIP activities and the implementation of PATL will be given to the faculties of both sites. Two teachers per grade level K-6 will implement PATL as well as two second grade teachers at the second site.

Third Implementation Session

The third Implementation Session was held on December 7 and 8, 1978 at the site. In attendance were the LAT, the Linker, the superintendent, one building principal, one additional reading teacher, a guidance counselor, and fourteen other teachers. The purpose of the meetings were to provide the classroom teachers, who volunteered, with the first part of the PATL training. The teachers were provided with an introduction to the PATL program, its background and rationale, as well as the major purpose of the program. The program links cognitive and affective growth through improvement of the self concept. The Linker and four teachers conducted the training.

The teachers received the PATL manual and supplementary materials. At the conclusion of the training session, teachers were assigned readings and activities to be completed before the next meeting.

The trainers will meet during the first week in January following the Christmas break to finalize the next part of the training session. Implementation will begin during the third week in January. In addition to having the kit advisors available to the teachers, a weekly PATL teachers' meeting will be held in each school to provide teachers an opportunity to communicate concerns and questions dealing with implementation of PATL. Teachers from three elementary schools in the district participated in the training.

Linker Memo of January 2, 1979

The PATL training took place on 12/7-8/78 for teachers from three elementary schools in the district. The last day of training before actual implementation begins will take place during the week of 1/15-19/79. Two teachers per grade level at the original site will implement as well as several teachers at the other two elementary schools.

Fourth Implementation Session

The fourth Implementation Session was held on January 5, 1979 at the Intermediate Unit office. Attending were the Linker, the LAT coordinator and three other teachers. The purpose of the meeting was to develop plans for the third 1/2 day of PATL training. The training session will take place on 1/15-16/79 at the original site from 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. The teachers will receive a memo on an update of the training plans and their assignments for the session. There will be a follow-up session on 1/25/79 at 3:30 p.m. to review initial PATL classroom implementation.

The following schedule of activities with specific trainer assignments was developed:

Linker
1. Review of PATL self-concept sessions 12/7-7/78.
2. Review of important definitions.
3. Discussion of teacher competencies.
4. View/discuss videotype "Last Hour Clash".
5. Discussion on PATL handouts #9, #10, #11, #12 in preparation for the presentation of the PATL Communication Model.

Teacher trainers (four)
1. Discussion on PATL "Mixed Sequences" presentation.
2. Discussion on the teacher list of ideas for PATL implementation.
3. Presentation of the PATL Communication Model Role Playing Exercises.

Linker
1. View/discuss video tape "Parent Crunch".
2. Review PATL interview evaluation.
3. Discuss the role of the kit advisors and specific class assignments.

PATL Trainers Memo of January 8, 1979

Now that we are all back to school after the holidays, your faithful PATL trainers thought it might be helpful to update you on the plans for the second semester.

As you know, when we completed the PATL training on 12/7-8/78 we had planned for one more half day in January before beginning implementation. The dates for the training are set for 1/15-16/79, a half day for each group. The following are a list of items you may want to attend to before the half day of training:

1. The reading of Haim Ginnot's book, Between Parent and Child.
2. Review pp. 47-53 in the PATL manual.
3. Review the handout on "Reinforcement".
4. Develop 3 or 4 ideas on how you would implement PATL in your classroom and what type of student behavior problem you might encounter in using PATL skills.

We are looking forward to working with you again and hope to have you begin to practice the PATL skills after the one-half day training.

Fifth Implementation Session

The fifth Implementation Session was held on January 15-16, 1979 at the site. Present

were the Linker, the LAT, and ten PATL teachers. The purpose of the two half-day sessions was to complete the PATL training and develop final plans for the PATL classroom implementation. The Linker and the four teacher trainers conducted the training.

Upon completion of the training, the teachers are to implement one or two of the PATL concepts in the classroom before 1/25/79 at which time they will share it with other teachers. The Coopersmith Inventory will be given to the students within the week. The classroom aides will score the test and results will be filed with counselors. An interim evaluation will be conducted in March by the Linker. The teachers reviewed the questions that were developed by the LAT. The kit advisors will be available to the teachers on an on-going basis. The PATL evaluations will be compiled and distributed to the teachers. Recommendations on the program will be presented to the superintendent for his review in relationship to the continuation or expansion of the program.

Sixth Implementation Session

The sixth Implementation Session was a dual session held on January 31, 1979 and February 6, 1979 at two of the elementary school sites in the district. Attending were the Linker and the LAT/PATL trainers. The purpose of the two meetings was to develop a schedule for the kit advisor's visitations to the PATL classroom teacher participants.

At the one site, the PATL trainer will visit classrooms of those teachers who have agreed to the visitations and who will visit each other as the implementation of PATL continues. The arrangements for the Trainer to have time for acting as the kit advisor will be worked out with the building principal.

At the original site, the two reading teachers will be the kit advisors. (One of these is also the LAT coordinator). The teachers have agreed cooperatively to the visitations and as the PATL program continues implementation, the teachers will plan to visit each other using the PATL communication model visitation form.[1] The time for the kit advisors to visit will be worked out with their building principal.

The visitations will begin during the week of February 19-26 and continue until the first week in April. It has been suggested that there be at least four visitations before April 1, 1979.

The evaluation interviews will take place during April. Interviews will be conducted by the Linker with each PATL teacher. The PATL visitations will then begin with two visitations conducted by the second week in May, before the final PATL evaluation is completed. The results of the evaluation will be developed into recommendations to the superintendent in regards to the continuation of the PATL Program.

1. See Appendix XVII.

SITE CASE STUDY

PART III

III. General Discussion

This section of the case study provides role descriptions of the Linker and the LAT, and a discussion of the Entry/Initiation, Needs Assessment, Selection, and Implementation activities. (The discussion of the Implementation phase is qualified and quantified by the delivery date of the case study, May 1, 1979). The anticipated and unanticipated outcomes of each major activity are also discussed.

A. Discussion of Entry/Initiation Activities

Role Description

The Linker was an active agent during this early phase of the project. He had the heavy responsibility of soliciting school district support and teacher participation. The Linker faced creating and maintaining good rapport with the central administration, the building principal, and the classroom teachers. His major task was to establish an LAT which could successfully function within the curricular conditions of the district. The Linker's role was not enhanced by the building principal's unwillingness to take an active role in the project. This lack of administrative leadership warrents close evaluation during the full term of the implementation stage and after that. The Linker was functioning in a district where decision-making is traditionally pyramidal and authoritarian.

The Linker was a planner, organizer, coordinator and teacher. Although he usually performed as a generalist, there were times when he relied on his former classroom experience and curricular expertise to act as a specialist. He achieved the difficult task of establishing and maintaining open lines of communication among the school district, the Intermediate Unit, and the outside agencies (SAT).

This was the critical period of recruitment and organization of the Local Action Team. The Linker expressed great patience in establishing the LAT. He successfully met the initial challenge of teacher cynicism, "I have been involved in these types of programs, and nothing happens". One of the two reading specialists, through group consensus, became LAT coordinator. Her direct relationship with the superintendent, enabled her to supplant the building principal who would not actively participate on the LAT. Thus she filled a leadership vacuum. The LAT, as a group maintained a cooperative, dedicated, role in the project. Their desire to improve the reading program was a constant concern and motivating factor.

Outcomes

1. The school district's central administration agreed to participate in PSIP. (anticipated)
2. The basic skill area of reading was identified as a problem area. (anticipated)
3. Entry was delayed by a teachers' strike. (unanticipated)
4. Specific concerns of the teachers were: (1) teacher role, (2) teacher benefits to be derived from the project, (3) time commitment, (4) teacher involvement in decision-making, and (5) amount of "paper work." (anticipated)
5. General acceptance of project activities by teachers and the expressed willingness to proceed to next step in process. (anticipated)
6. The introduction of a curricular change process (problem-solving and knowledge utilization) into a Pennsylvania sshool district. (anticipated)

7. The identification of "traditional American" education at the site. This included lack of shared decision-making, teaching excellence, and heavy reliance on textbooks as the basis for the instructional program. (unanticipated)
8. Teachers viewed PSIP as an answer to solve their reading problems. (anticipated)
9. The school district's acceptance of outside agencies functioning within an elementary school. (anticipated)
10. Identification of curricular conditions within the school district. (unanticipated)
11. Teachers' expression of lack of communication and common planning time as barriers to improving the reading program. (unanticipated)
12. Formation of the LAT. (anticipated)
13. Selection of reading specialist as the LAT coordinator. (unanticipated)

The need to improve reading achievement was identified by the EQA and confirmed through teacher interviews. The district's commitment to PSIP was an acknowledgement of the need for outside assistance to attack the problem. The willingness of the teachers to participate without tangible rewards, such as money, was indicative of a degree of professionalism and a degree of acquiescence to an authoritarian type central administration. Teacher commitment was high and showed a strong faith in the promise of PSIP for improvement of the reading program. Since no specific product was offered initially, the teachers reacted to nebulous possibilities of a process for solving the problems of low achievement and low self-esteem among the school's population. In one sense, the teachers were being coerced into action because of curricular conditions which are barriers to problem-solving in their frustrating, rural, disadvantaged environment. The promise of outside help was the motivating force and reward. "PSIP sounds great if it can produce." "I've tried things in the past, but never got support or approval!"

The introduction of a process for curricular improvement in a "traditional American", rural, educational setting had a positive beginning. Resistance soon subsided after the LAT met with an LAT coordinator from another school district. Teacher attitude was favorable and the SAT and the LAT had the support of the district's central administration. The community was not involved in the process. Lay participation might have contributed a productive ingredient, but there has been no precedent for community involvement in curriculum development in this particular school district. At present, there is no organizational structure which would allow for it.

B. Discussion of Needs Assessment Activities

Role Description

The Linker began showing a sense of urgency in meeting time deadlines. He continued actively leading the LAT by conducting meetings, maintaining open lines of communication, and in the preparation of pertinent materials. He also continued his functions of scheduling meetings and recording the minutes thereof. However, one became more aware of a pressure to "stay on track" and "on schedule" as the activities progressed. This was clearly reflected in format changes and when there was overlapping in sessions of modular content. There was a threat of increased confusion by introducing these changes, but generally the revamping of format was successfully accomplished. The Linker managed the events accordingly, but forced more convergent thinking because of

the stress of completing tasks on time. There was some evidence of manuvering away from in-depth discussions of important terms and analytical concepts. This was subtle, but present.

The LAT's leadership remained firm and consistant throughout this section of activities. The LAT coordinator was efficient and teamed well with the Linker who was still the prime mover of the project. The LAT was not skilled in analysis techniques and data interpretation. The SAT experienced difficulty in working with the LAT. The Linker and the LRDC representative made too many assumptions that the LAT understood and could interpret test results. Classroom teachers are not necessarily competent in testing, test interpretation, and application of interpretations in curriculum development. This phase's pace slowed and became extended because of the incompetencies of the LAT. The Linker and the SAT made large contributions to the process at this point. The attitude of the LAT remained very positive and the LAT members were actively involved. Some feeling of discontent with central administration's testing policies was expressed.

Outcomes

1. The strike delayed entry and the pressure of the over-all timetable of completion dates caused the SAT to alter the format and streamline the process. (unanticipated)
2. Completion of Student Needs Statement. (anticipated)
3. Completion of Program Needs Statement. (anticipated)
4. Introduction of Selection concepts. (unanticipated)
5. Identification of major problem areas: Comprehension (oral, written, reading), Vocabulary (spoken, written, listening), and Self-concept (attitude toward learning). (unanticipated)
6. Determination of insufficient reliable data for LAT's decision-making. (unanticipated)
7. SAT displays urgency of completing project on time. (unanticipated)
8. K-6 was identified as target population. (unanticipated)
9. LAT emphasizes affective domain as a priority in problem-solving. (unanticipated)
10. Introduction of selection phase. (unanticipated)
11. Additional data collected. (unanticipated)
12. Building principal remained removed from LAT's activities. (unanticipated)

PSIP is a systematic, problem-solving process aligned in a sequential, logical format. Even though a system is sequential, implementation thereof is dependent on the varying conditions of the setting in which the system is implemented. The Linker faithfully adhered to the schedule when possible, but he was flexible and allowed alterations when necessary. However, the pressure of the timetable was ever present and his behavior was affected at times. The urgency was displayed through comments, changing the format, and the introduction of products which met similar needs in other PSIP sites. Convergent thinking was more apparent especially in the suggested products selection. A less elaborate procedure in product selection was followed at this site than was attempted in sites who made earlier entry into the PSIP process.

The completion of the Student Needs Statement and the Program Needs Statement represented early success through cooperative planning and decision-making. The analysis process, although not clearly understood by the teachers, especially the interpretation of data, established a firm basis for the Selection Phase. The additional data collected improved the possibility of better product selection, but didn't appear to do so. Such factors as visitations, Linker suggestion, SAT suggestion, the administration's financial support and commitment seems to have greater import.

The LAT coordinator provided adequate team leadership in tandem with the Linker. Her direct relationship with the superintendent was the edge required to maintain the directorship of the LAT's efforts. Her role was not particularly easy in light of the building principal's deliberate non-participation. Although the LAT accepted his behavior as "normal" the "real" implications will be tested, on the longer term, after the project is left totally in the hands of the LAT. The LAT's attitude remained very positive throughout the analysis phase.

C. Discussion of Selection Activities

Role Description

The Linker's relationship with the LAT continued on a friendly, cooperative basis. Rapport was good. His strategy of guiding the LAT through pre-planned modules and simultaneously encouraging shared decisions resulted in a better functioning team. The authoritarianism of the central administration continued to cloud the outcome of his and the LAT's efforts. The Linker maintained his generalist role. He continued to conduct meetings, arrange visitations, maintain open lines of communication, and generally support the wishes of the LAT. The Linker maintained his role as project authority. As the LAT evolved as a planning unit, the Linker's control of the situation did not diminish, but was more subtle. The dynamics of the LAT membership caused the Linker to remain firm at all times.

The LAT functioned smoothly during this phase despite some outward expression of animosity toward the administration. Cynicism was expressed in some of the sessions. The superintendent's authoritarian approach to decision-making contributed to this condition. The LAT evolved as a dedicated team of teachers with a major emphasis on the goal of their pupils' improved self-concepts. The team did momentarily tire of the analytical process in anticipation of "moving on" to implementation. The LAT was enthusiastic about visitations and participated actively. Morale remained high.

Outcomes

1. LAT prioritized goals for improvement. (anticipated)
2. Identification of district's curriculum development process as not systematic, more "hit and miss". (unanticipated)
3. LAT established selection criteria. (anticipated)
4. LAT's decision-making ground rules were established. (anticipated)
5. Teacher animosity toward school administration became evident. (unanticipated)
6. PATL selected as major product for implementation. (unanticipated)
7. Planning for Implementation introduced. (anticipated)
8. District's in-service program identified as inconsistent and ineffective. (unanticipated)
9. Superintendent approves product selection and states his support of plans. (anticipated)
10. Students' self-concept ranked as top priority. (unanticipated)
11. Implementation planning includes dissemination and participation in two other sites within the district. (unanticipated)

The PSIP model is a grand opportunity for a school district to build a systematic, curriculum development process while simultaneously improving its instructional program. It is a learning experience for teachers which forces application of their teaching

skills. The teacher interviews in the district revealed the need to establish a consistent and shared approach to improving the educational program. The district's current curricular conditions are somewhat regressive and act as a barrier to innovation and creativeness. The superintendent's move to expand the PSIP process into all three elementary schools could have a favorable effect on system-wide curriculum development. However, unless curricular conditions are altered, accomplishments will be limited.

The PATL program offers significant opportunity to change teacher behavior through in-service activity. The PATL segment selected for implementation by the LAT is aimed at improvement of self-esteem. Participation is voluntary. This product was selected to complement the Economy Reading series already in use in the district.

The selection of the PATL product was caused by a combination of conditions and reasons. The LAT was influenced by the following: (1) the need to bring to conclusion a process which was long term in nature, (2) the convergent suggestions of the Linker and the SAT to solve learning problems similar to other PSIP participating school districts, (3) if a selected product was not included in RISE's pool of validated products, the district would be responsible for the entire cost, (4) the subordinate role of teachers in decision-making within the district, (5) the frugality of the school board with an emphasis on restricted budgets, (6) the unstated resistance of this group of teachers to select a very sophisticated product, and (7) the tendency to find simple answers to complex problems.

D. Discussion of Implementation Activities

(At the time of the completion and delivery of the case study, the Implementation phase was not completed. The implementation and evaluation of the product is on a short and long term basis. The case study could only include a discussion based on the short term.)

Role Description

The Linker continued his cooperative coordination of the project. Rapport with the SAT and the LAT remained good. The Linker performed consistently and did not expand his role or functions beyond the dimensions of the project. He continued to establish meetings, conduct the meetings, lend support to the LAT, and applied the assistance of the SAT when appropriate. There was evidence of routinization of the SAT/LAT meetings, especially in presentation of "new materials". This was not a barrier to progress, but did inspire too much convergent thinking and action. The Linker was flexible and resilient in dealing with the LAT. He was sensitive to the team's needs throughout the project.

The LAT continued its effort to successfully complete all tasks. The team maintained high morale and diligently worked to completion of all tasks. Planning for implementation and evaluation was accomplished. The LAT willingly participated in the in-service training. The short assessment of the participating teachers showed be a general satisfaction with the product. The long term effect is yet to be measured. The implementation of the product was expanded to include two other elementary schools within the district. The strong leadership of the LAT made this expansion possible. The building principal did not participate in the process. This factor may have a detrimental effect on the project.

Outcomes

1. Superintendent renewed his commitment to support implementation of the R & D product. (anticipated)
2. LAT participated in the PATL training. (anticipated)
3. LAT implementated PATL. (anticipated)
4. Self-concept and motivation were the two PATL segments selected for implementation. (unanticipated)
5. Planning for evaluation of PATL was accomplished. (anticipated)
6. Implementation was expanded to include two other elementary schools within the district. (unanticipated)
7. Schedule of evaluations was established. (anticipated)
8. Linker was identified as evaluator of short term assessment. (unanticipated)
9. In-service credits awarded for participation in PATL. (unanticipated)

The final product implemented was a segment from within a total product. It was done this way to satisfy the needs of the participating teachers according to their assessment of their needs and the needs of their students. The measurement of the success of an in-service product is difficult. It is a matter of how one views the achievement either on a long term or short term basis. The long term influence of the teachers' behavior on students in the classroom is significant.

Implementation is not simply an extension of planning and adoption processes. It's a phenomenon in its own right. The extent to which an innovation will be implemented as planned depends on (1) how well the users understand it, (2) their individual competencies and capabilities, (3) whether appropriate materials are available, (4) whether organizational structures are congruent with the innovation, and (5) the extent to which the users are motivated. The teachers did not appear to have a deep understanding of the concepts involved in PATL, but enough to have impact on student behavior. Some did not necessarily agree with the concepts, therefore implementation was not uniformly conducted. The LAT members have the competencies and capabilities to implement successfully. There were enough materials to use, however, the supply was limited. No official organizational changes were implemented at the time of the writing of the case study. No teaming was proposed. No common planning time was built into the schedule. PSIP's long term effect as a change process in a regressive school environment was in question and could not be shown at the time of this writing.

SITE CASE STUDY
PART IV

44

PART IV

Analysis of PSIP at Site 5056

The general educational scene of Western Pennsylvania is traditional, insular, and disadvantaged. The dominant geographical pattern of many scattered pockets of population is a major influence on the regressiveness of the area. The absence of the cultural impact of a large metropolitan center limits the sophistication of the people. The City of Erie offers little culture for the peoples of the region. Small geopolitical units means limited financial resources and resultant low school budgets. And this means lower teacher salaries which are unattractive to highly competent, quality teachers. And what is the curriculum, but the teacher! Site # 5056 contains average teachers with average skills. The site is limited in teaching excellence.

PSIP's entry into Site 5056 was a challenge of far reaching dimension and importance. This opportunity to solve curricular problems through a process of systematic problem-solving and knowledged utilization had impact on a disadvantaged educational environment. The organizational arrangement of the district and a general lack of progressiveness did not support curriculum development. No common planning time for teachers! No expertise in teaming! No system-wide curriculum planning council! No regular in-service program! No system of utilizing test data in teacher decision-making! No standing curriculum committees! No innovative precedence in the district! Instead, what prevails is an atmosphere of authoritarian, pyramidal decision-making and self-contained type teaching. No continuous progress programs! The scene is comfortable, secure, but a barrier to change. The teachers are frustrated by the curricular conditions which restrict shared decision-making and progressiveness.

PSIP is not "just another" program. It is potent. If taken to its logical conclusion, the process could cause large scale reorganization in programs and curricular processes. The model is quite simple; Teacher decision-making supported by contemporary educational research. Focusing research and development on curricular problems! But the implementation and dissemination of the process is the engagement of complexities and internal conditions of systems which are resistant to change. PSIP's predicted success is dependent of the Linker's competencies and strategies, community pressure for change, individual teacher competencies, administrative posture, and a host of other significant curricular conditions. The strongest underlying factor which exerts maximum influence in decision-making is the availability of financial resources. Teachers are not privy to school budget development and control. Even though their functions are directly affected, the teachers have little or no voice in financial expenditures and allotments. At this site, the LAT was restricted by what "it will cost" and "I doubt if they will spend the money." The restraints of a low budget played a serious role in the product selection process. The LAT could not ask for monies they knew would not be granted, even though the selection might be "the answer".

The community did not participate in the project. This was a missed opportunity, In most progressive school districts throughout the nation, lay participation has shown to be a positive factor in system-wide curriculum planning. The whole issue of "low self-concept" is directly related to the home environment. Community involvement would have provided an important ingredient during the analysis phase and the selection phase. It is an unfortunate condition of the school district when laymen are not encouraged to participate in curriculum improvement programs.

The EQA identified mathematics and reading skills achievement as problem areas in the elementary school site. In examining these areas, the LAT expressed concern about the affective concept of student self-concept. This identification of priority is important because the affect has been shown to be a key to raising cognitive achievement. The LAT stressed self esteem and selected the PATL program as a means to rectifying the problem. The superintendent's decision to expand the implementation of PATL to all three elementary schools was a wise decision. Total involvement is a self-reinforcing process. Establishing a broad responsive environment is important for maximum success. The PATL program is aimed at changing teacher behavior which a teacher cannot readily do in isolation. Shared participation is effective.

The behavior of the Linker was consistently dependable, accommodating, and productive. He maintained a respectable working relationship with all parties in the project. If the building principal had taken an active role in the LAT activities, the Linker would not have had to assume an authoritarian role and could have functioned more as a consultant to the team. As it was, he maintained a soft, but firm control of matters working very effectively with the LAT coordinator and school superintendent. His style was dictated by the "timetable" and at times some confusion resulted when the LAT was moved too rapidly theough a module. This was apparent during the Analysis Phase when the LAT experienced difficulty in understanding data interpretations. The Linker's patience was tested many times, but he always maintained his composure. He strategically encouraged the team to function "on its own" and tried to avoid direct involvement in decision-making. Unfortunately, the LAT was very conditioned to not making shared decisions and the Linker was more involved than he wished. There were times when the Linker might have varied his approaches in the group process. A variety of instructional techniques might have been used to make "things more interesting". Some work sessions were not paced according to what is known about people's attention spans. There was tendency to "cover too much in one sitting". Some issues were left unclear because the language was not clarified or explained. A few probing questions might have revealed the misunderstanding which prevailed. Wherever and whenever possible, the Linker did apply additional resources to meet the needs of the immediate situation.

The role of the Linker was fundamental to the success of the project. His teaching and group processing skills were tested continuously. The stagnant environment of the site was stirred by his presence in the school setting. He was an "outsider" who served the teachers by taking the weight of "doing something about our problem" and the responsibility of leading the group. Relying on outsiders can be reassuring, but also threatening to teachers. The Linker's friendly, but "no nonsense" style took the "sting" out of the interfacing with the SAT. There were moments when "staying on schedule" was non-productive. But on the whole, the Linker was able to guide an average group of teachers through an important curricular process to achieving well-established goals. His pacing of the team was commendable in light of the constraints of a teacher strike, weather caused delays and the fact that he served the linkage of several school districts in the area.

The SAT served the project productively. The outside resource persons never "got between people". They were supportive to the LAT's decision-making and were an essential ingredient in the success of the project. The SAT never expressed a condescending attitude toward the LAT, but stayed on "their level" throughout the sessions. The SAT was in a position to be too directive and even dictatorial, but was not. There were episodes when communications between the LAT and certain members of the SAT were unclear. Generally, however, the SAT made significant contributions to the project.

The LAT was composed of only teachers. This was unusual, since the building principals in other sites were active participants in the process. At this site, however, the building principal chose to not participate. This left an administrative vacuum which was filled by one of the leading specialists, who became the LAT coordinator. The Linker and the LAT coordinator were forced to "work around" the principal. This situation did not deter the team's accomplishment, but the long term effect of the building principal's behavior should be assessed. The LAT functioned well together. They never expressed open antagonism toward each other and conflicts seemed non-existent. They did express animosity toward the central administration and a lack of confidence in the support they would receive in the project. Their past experience of working in a self-contained school did not hinder as much as delay their evolution into a cooperative planning team. But they were enthusiastic, and generally followed the leadership of the Linker and the LAT coordinator without much question. As the LAT gained more experience, individual members contributed more to the tasks at hand.

The LAT was a dedicated group who entered the project without the promise of tangible rewards. Their motivation lay in the hope that "something good will develop". The administrative decision to participate was the initial "push" for the teachers. The option to not participate was taken by several in the school. However, the "core" who joined were sincerely looking for a way to improve their learning environments. Their underlying motivation was the child.

The LAT members' behavior has changed since implementing PATL. They have found a pronounced effect on their relationships with their students. The full impact of their actions is yet to be determined. However, the training has moved the teachers in a more positive direction. It can be concluded that PSIP has been successful in many dimensions; (1) It has introduced a change process into a regressive, disadvantaged school district, (2) It has provided in-depth planning for a group of teachers, (3) It has changed the teaching behavior of teachers, (4) It has raised curricular issues, which if resolved, could have long term effect in improving the district's educational programs, and (5) It has provided a means for systematically solving problems and utilizing knowledge. As any system, PSIP works "if you make it work for you".

APPENDICES

"Pulse" Visit Questions

General:

1. What reading materials do you use in your classes?

2. What math materials do you use in your classes?

3. What reading teaching method do you use (whole word, phonics, linguistics, ITA, combination of these)?

4. What math teaching method do you use?

5. Are you satisfied with the progress of most of your students in reading?

6. Are you satisfied with the progress of most of your students in math?

7. If you are not satisfied, have you any suggestion about the reason for unsatisfactory progress?

8. Do you have a remedial reading program in your school? A special teacher for it? For how many children who require remedial work?

Opportunity: Does the time allotted and the curriculum used give the student the opportunity to learn the skills sampled?

Rationale: Improved performance may result from increasing the amount of time the learner is actively involved in instruction in a curriculum that has a high degree of overlap with the objectives tested on the criterion measure.

9. How much time (in minutes) does your class spend on reading daily? Math?

Motivation: Do the classroom materials and personnel encourage the learner to engage in the learning activities?

Rationale: Improved student performance may result if the materials and personnel encourage student participation and learning.

10. Does your school have a library? Do you consider it adequate? Appropriate for the student population? Are all students taught how to use it?

11. Do most of your students seem to find the math material interesting?

12. Do most of your students seem to find the reading material interesting?

Motivation (Continued):

13. If your answer to either of the above questions is "no", can you specify which group is uninterested in the reading materials?

slowest readers
average readers
best readers

Math
slowest math students
average math students
best math students

14. Do students correct any of their own worksheets? tests?

15. Do students select their own materials in math? in reading?

16. Are there games or other materials available in your classroom that help students practice math skills or reading?

Structure and Placement: Is the curriculum specified, sequence and organized and are there provisions for matching pupils' skills with appropriate content?

Rationale: Improved student performance may result if the teacher, using a structured curriculum that embodies specific goals, makes her objectives and expectations clear to the students and matches instruction to assessed student needs and abilities.

17. Do you work with students in small homogeneous groups?

18. Do some students tutor other students?

19. Do you design some of your own materials? Do you add supplementary materials from other sources to the regularly adopted math or reading materials? Name them (i.e. games, flash cards)

20. Do your reading materials base progression on achievement of specific objectives?

21. Do your math materials base progression on achievement of specific objectives?

22. Are all students in your class working on the same objective at any given time in reading? in math?

23. Would you say your reading materials are not carefully structured or sequenced, moderately well structured and sequenced, or highly structured and appropriately sequenced?

24. Are your math materials poorly sequenced, somewhat carefully sequenced, or sequenced in small steps to make mastery possible for all students?

Structure and Placement (Continued):

25. *Types of objectives in reading (check one)

general ___
specific ___
both general and specific ___
no objectives ___

26. *If any specific objectives are present, rate the reading curriculum on the clarity of its specific objectives.

Unclear				Clear
1	2	3	4	5

27. *At the beginning of the year, how do you decide where a child should start in reading or in which reading group he/she belongs? (Check appropriate lines)

By starting at the beginning of the text or series ___
By the results of a standardized test ___
By the results of a curriculum-designed test ___
By the results of a test you developed ___
From the placement of the child at the end of the previous year ___
From the wishes of the child ___
Other, please specify _____
_____

28. *Types of objectives in math (check one)

general ___
specific ___
both general and specific ___
no objectives ___

29. *If any specific objectives are present, rate the math curriculum on the clarity of its specific objectives.

Unclear				Clear
1	2	3	4	5

30. *Rate the math curriculum as to how closely the available materials match the stated objectives.

No Match				Close Match
1	2	3	4	5

*From Cooley-Lairhardt design study (1975)

Structure and Placement (Continued):

31. *At the beginning of the year, how do you decide where a child should start in math or in which match group he/she belongs? (Check appropriate lines)

By starting at the beginning of the text or series ___
By the results of a standardized test ___
By the results of a curriculum-designed test ___
By the results of a test you developed ___
From the placement of the child at the end of the previous year ___
From the wishes of the child ___
Other, please specify _____
_____

Instructional Events: Does the classroom management permit the learning process to occur and does the teacher focus on an accurate presentation?

Rationale: Improved student performance may result if classroom management requires a minimum of teacher energy to maintain permitting the teacher to focus on the cognitive objectives. Improved student performance may also result if the teacher has mastery of the content and can convey it to students clearly.

32. Do you have any parent or aide assistance in your classroom?

33. *Rate the reading curriculum as to how closely the available materials match the stated objectives.

No Match				Close Match
1	2	3	4	5

Press for Achievement: Do parents show an interest in school and school achievement? Are parents' aspirations for their student's present and future work appropriate?

Rationale: Parents' interest in school and their student's school achievement as well as parents' aspirations for student achievement and future may affect student performance.

34. Do parents respond to school requests and messages?

35. Do parents attend school conferences, PTA meetings, etc.?

36. Do parents participate in school curriculum decisions or planning groups?

37. Are parents aware of their student's achievement and progress in school? Do they show concern for the student's progress?

Instructional Interaction: Does the home provide support, direction and knowledge conducive to carrying on learning in the home?

Rationale: Parents' assistance and direction with school work and their involvement in shaping educational plans and work-study habits, may affect student performance.

38. Do parents help their students with homework?

39. Do parents have expectations about their student doing homework and the quality of the homework?

40. Do parents have the knowledge necessary to help the student with schoolwork?

Opportunity for Learning: To what extent does the home permit and provide activities and resources that contribute to student learning?

Rationale: The number and quality of activities and resources within the home and the frequency and quality with which resources outside the home are utilized to provide educational experiences may affect student performance.

41. Do parents encourage or support the student's participation in youth groups and/or out-of-school lessons (music, dancing, art, etc.)?

42. Do parents visit other educational institutions (museum, library, zoo, etc.) with students?

43. Does the home regularly receive newspapers and/or magazines?

APPENDIX II

GENERAL NEEDS STATEMENT

Who is affected?

Students in grades K-6 who are not working up to their ability and or grade level.

What kind of a need is it?

1. There is a need to improve student motivation.
2. There is a need to improve students' ability to work independently.
3. There is a need to improve the continuity in implementing the reading curriculum.
4. There is a need to review and analyze the present schedule in relationship to teacher preparation time and common planning time.

What are the goals for improvement?

1. Teachers would utilize a variety of techniques and approaches to motivate students' interest in reading.
2. Clearer directions would be given by the teachers to the children and through practice the students would take on more responsibility for completing assignments independently.
3. To identify and adapt a reading management system that would improve the continuity within the reading curriculum K-6.
4. Teachers would have an opportunity, within the limitations of the present schedule, for a common structured planning time within grade levels or subject areas.

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS
I. Comprehensive (oral, written, reading) A. Literal B. Inferential C. Imagery	Stanford Achievement Test teacher made tests Botel word opposite test Text test		
II. Vocabulary (Spoken, written, listening) A. Word Meaning B. Multiple meanings C. Context clues	Stanford Achievement Test Teacher made Teacher judgment Text test Botel word opposite		
III. Affective A. Self-concept B. Attitude toward reading	Attitude toward reading Comprehensive reading plan test student survey		

APPENDIX III

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS
I. Comprehensive (oral, written, reading)	Stanford Achievement Test teacher made tests Botel word opposite test Text test	TO BE DETERMINED	
II. Vocabulary (Spoken, written, listening) A. Word Meaning B. Multiple meanings C. Context clues	Stanford Achievement Test Teacher made Teacher judgment Text test Botel word opposite		
III. Affective A self concept	Attitude toward Reading CPRT Student Survey 1-6	All students in Grades 1-6 enrolled in this school 1. 90% of the 1st grade students will have a positive self-concept 2. 80% of the 2nd grade students will have a positive self-concept 3. 80% of the 3rd grade students will have a positive self-concept 4. 75% of the 4th grade students will have a positive self-concept 5. 75% of the 5th grade students will have a positive self-concept 6. 70% of the 6th grade students will have a positive self-concept.	According to the CPRT student survey: 1. 85% of the 1st grade students have a positive self-concept 2. 66% of the 2nd grade students have a positive self-concept 3. 68% of the 3rd grade students have a positive self-concept 4. 63% of the 4th grade students have a positive self-concept 5. 62% of the 5th grade students have a positive self-concept 6. 57% of the 6th grade students have a positive self-concept

APPENDIX IV

N. 23 First Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	2	1%
At grade level:	10	43%
Below grade level:	13	56%

N. 28 Second Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	9	32%
At grade level:	11	39%
Below grade level:	8	29%

N.28 Third Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	14	50%
At grade level:	8	29%
Below grade level:	6	21

N. 28 Fourth Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	15	55%
At grade level:	3	10%
Below grade level:	10	35%

N. 32 Fifth Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	9	28%
At grade level:	12	37%
Below grade level:	11	35%

N. 30 Sixth Grade: Botel Word Opposite/Word Recognition/Comprehension

	#	%
Above grade level:	3	10%
At grade level:	13	43%
Below grade level:	14	47%

APPENDIX V

SELF-CONCEPT

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
44.	I think I am one of the worst readers in my class.	6%	2%	2%	88%	2%
12.	I get worried when I am asked to read something.	21%	10%	12%	57%	-
33.	I am happiest when I am reading.	93%	-	-	2%	5%
28.	I feel good about my reading	83%	1%	1%	10%	5%
29.	Most kids my age read better than I do.	34%	5%	-	59%	2%
4.	I get nervous when the teacher asks me to read out loud.	71%	8%	2%	69%	-

ATTITUDE TOWARD READING

39.	I would like reading better if someone would help me with it	38%	10%	4%	43%	5%
40.	I like to start a new book.	88%	1%	1%	5%	5%
36.	I read whenever I have any free time.	91%		2%	3%	4%
1.	Learning to read is important	92%	5%	2%	1%	
17.	I would rather do almost anything than read.	13%	4%	5%	77%	1%
27.	I usually understand a story the first time I read it.	66%	13%		13%	8%

APPENDIX VI

QUESTIONS	FIRST +	FIRST −	SECOND +	SECOND −	THIRD +	THIRD −	FOURTH +	FOURTH −	FIFTH +	FIFTH −	SIXTH +	SIXTH −
44.	84%	50%	83%	69%	85%	64%	90%	74%	77%	66%	88%	72%
12.	67%	50%	61%	43%	77%	56%	64%	59%	62%	40%	60%	33%
33.	92%	67%	78%	71%	60%	65%	51%	50%	58%	56%	44%	32%
28.	99%	66%	87%	93%	84%	93%	81%	80%	90%	74%	82%	72%
29.	34%	33%	54%	34%	54%	34%	9%	30%	45%	31%	43%	21%
4.	9%	34%	54%	52%	53%	50%	61%	66%	58%	44%	48%	34%
Number of Students who responded			69 / 103	34	64 / 101	37	56 / 105	49	71 / 108	37	80 / 118	38

GRADE LEVEL	% POOR SELF-CONCEPT	CURRENT	DESIRED	DISCREPANCY
1st				
2nd	34%	66%	80%	14%
3rd	32%	68%	80%	12%
4th	37%	63%	75%	12%
5th	38%	62%	75%	13%
6th	43%	57%	70%	33%

QUESTIONS	FIRST +	FIRST −	SECOND +	SECOND −	THIRD +	THIRD −	FOURTH +	FOURTH −	FIFTH +	FIFTH −	SIXTH +	SIXTH −
39.			35%	74%	35%	71%	36%	58%	32%	65%	34%	66%
40.			85%	72%	93%	98%	96%	82%	91%	87%	82%	72%
36.			72%	62%	73%	74%	78%	58%	73%	64%	33%	40%
27.			80%	73%	68%	77%	79%	66%	87%	65%	68%	48%
Number of Students who responded			69% / 103	34%	64% / 101	37%	56% / 105	49%	76% / 108	32%	80% / 118	38%
Average %			74%	75%	74%	80%	76%	75%	76%	75%	68%	66%

APPENDIX VII

Comprehension Score Data for End of Grade 5

Stanine	No. Right	G. E.	Grade 5 Distribution
7-8-9	48+	7.7+	20%
4-5-6	24 - 77	4.4 - 7.6	63%
1-2-3	Less 23	Less 4.2	17%

Stanine Distribution by Percentages for Total Reading, Vocabulary, and Comprehension for Grades 1-6 Stanford Achievement Test Administered Spring 1977

Stanines	Grades																	
	1			2			3			4			5			6		
	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.	Total Reading	Voc.	Comp.
1-2-3	5	3	4	11	4	12	12	6	16	14	15	17	17	22	17	11	15	13
4-5-6	32	44	37	44	52	46	54	52	52	43	58	47	56	62	63	58	64	58
7-8-9	63	53	60	45	44	42	34	42	32	43	27	37	27	16	20	31	21	29

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores for Paragraph Meaning/Comprehension

Year	Grades					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1973	2.4	3.0	3.7	5.1	5.9	6.9
1974	2.5	3.5	3.6	5.2	6.4	6.5
1975		3.6	4.4	5.6	6.4	8.0
1976						
1977	2.9	3.7	4.4	5.6	6.3	7.6

Comprehension Score Data for End of Grade 6

Stanine	No. Right	G. E.	Grade 6 Distribution	I. Q.	% Rank
7-8-9	55+	9.5	29%	112	77
4-5-6	29 - 54	5.2 - 9.3	58%	88-111	23-76
1-2-3	Less 29	Less 5.0	13%	87	1-21

The first page shows the mean stanines for each sub-test at the various grade levels.

It would appear that in grades 1 and 2 the language arts and reading instruction is very effective. Data show decline in average achievement in grades 3 through 6. It may be due to a lower potential for these classes or less effective materials and program. One might get a better picture if he would follow several classes through all six grades to determine if there is a similar pattern.

On the last three pages I have prepared distribution charts by below average, average, and above average achievement for the various reading and language arts sub-tests by grade. The normal distribution for the general population would be 23.5%, 53%, and 23.5%. Generally speaking the percentage falling in the above average category decreases from grades 1 through 6 and increases in the other two.

Tests.

Stanines
April - 1977

	Grades..					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Vocabulary	9	8	7	6	5	5
Reading - Part A	9	9				
Reading Part B	9	9				
Reading Comp.	9	9	6	6	5	6
Word Study Skills	9	8	8	8	5	8
Math Concepts	8	6	7	5	6	5
Math Computation	8	6	6	8	6	6
Math Appli		6	7	7	5	6
Spelling		7	5	7	5	6
Language.			6	6	5	6
Lod Sk.		8	6	6	5	6
Science		9	7	7	7	6
Listening.	9	9	9	7	8	6
Total Read	9	9	7	7	5	6
Total Math.	9	6	6	7	5	6
Total Aud.	9	9	8	7	6	6
Comp. Batt.	8	7	7	7	6	6

Distribution by Stanine.

Percentage of Class.

~~Vocabulary~~ Grades.	Below Ave. 1-2-3	Average. 4-5-6	Above Average. 7-8-9.
Vocabulary.			
1	3	44	53
2	4	52	44
3	6	52	42
4	15	58	27
5	22	62	16
6	15	64	21
Reading Comp.			
1	4	37	60
2	12	46	42
3	16	52	32
4	17	47	37
5	17	63	20
6	13	58	29
Word Study Skills			
1	8	26	66
2	13	49	39
3	7	57	36
4	16	45	39
5	18	58	24
6	7	61	32

		Below Ave 1-2-3	Average 4-5-6	Above Ave. 7-8-9	
Spelling	1				
	2	10	68	22	
	3	24	53	23	
	4	21	46	33	
	5	21	62	17	
	6	22	54	24	
Language	1				
	2				
	3	18	53	29	
	4	16	49	35	
	5	22	56	22	
	6	14	56	30	
Listening	1	6	37	57	
	2	6	49	45	
	3	9	44	47	
	4	11	51	38	
	5	13	55	32	
	6	19	49	32	

67

	Below Ave 1-2-3	Average 4-5-6	Above Ave 7-8-9
Total Reading			
1	5	32	63
2	11	44	45
3	12	54	34
4	14	43	43
5	17	56	27
6	11	58	31
Total Auditory.			
1	4	38	58
2	6	49	46
3	8	43	49
4	10	58	31
5	13	68	19
6	19	56	25
Comp. Battery.			
1	5	31	64
2	8	49	42
3	10	52	38
4	14	52	34
5	17	58	25
6	14	59	27

APPENDIX VIII
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
APRIL 1977

National Normal Distribution

23 - 54 - 23

CONTENT AREA
STUDENT BEHAVIOR

April 1977/Stanford Achievement Test

	Grades	Desired Standard	Current Standard
Vocabulary	1	15-60-25	3-44-53
	2	15-45-40	4-52-44
	3	15-60-25	6-52-42
	4	20-60-20	15-58-27
	5	20-55-25	22-62-16
	6	20-60-20	15-64-21
Comprehension	1	20-55-25	4-37-60
	2	20-55-25	12-46-42
	3	20-60-20	16-52-32
	4	20-60-20	17-47-37
	5	20-60-20	17-63-20
	6	20-60-20	13-58-29

APPENDIX IX

PROGRAM ANALYSIS REPORT
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES

The following results were obtained by analyzing the responses given by the following grade level teachers:

2 Grade 1
2 Grade 2
1 Grade 3
2 Grade 4
1 Grade 5
1 Grade 6
2 Reading Specialists
11 Total Responding

PROGRAM ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITY

Item #1, #2 and #3

The average class size for the nine classroom teachers responding is 28 students. The average daily attendance is 97% and the attendance was typical for the classes.

Item #4 and #5

Teachers reported that on the average, students typically spend 20 minutes each day in a teacher directed group reading lesson. Teachers also reported that on the average they spend 160 minutes in a day teaching reading.

Item #6

Teachers reported that during a reading class when a students is not in a teacher-directed reading group, he or she are more likely to be doing:

1. *Seatwork from a reading workbook*
2. *Silent reading in the Basal*
3. *Silent reading in a book or magazine which the student choses.*

Other types of activities pointed out by the teachers were:

SRA	*Draw illustrations*
Creative Words	*Listen to story*
Riddles	*Flashcards*
Pictures	*Creative Writing*
Titles-Cards	*Poetry*
Weather Calendar	*Interest centers*
Pets and other general projects	*Specific skills*
Watch Movie	*Dittoes*
Spectrum of Spelling	*Reading related games*

Item #7

Teachers reported that during an average week, reading instruction was interrupted between less than once per week to no more than twice per week.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS
MOTIVATORS

Item #1

Teachers reported that they use a variety of instructional media for student assignments. The following list indicates the frequency:

1. Basal textbooks are used at least 5 or more times for student assignments.
2. Workbooks or sheets one or two times per week in student assignments.
3. Books other than basal texts are used 1-2 times per week in student assignments.
4. Audio tapes and filmstrips are included less than once per week in student assignments.
5. Puzzles, games and flash cards are included 1 to 2 times per week in student assignments.
6. Manipulatives are used 1 to 2 times per week for student assignments.

Item #2

Teachers reported that after a student completes a reading assignment, on the average the student receives information on the correctness of his or her performance within 24 hours for drill sheets, homework, chapter or unit tests and special reading assignments.

Item #3

Teachers reported that during an average week the following activities occur during reading instruction with the following frequency:

1. Students manage their own in-class behavior 3-4 times per week.
2. There is peer tutoring less than once per week.
3. Students assess their own work less than once per week.
4. Conversations with student on non-school matters 1 to 4 times per week.
5. Formal meetings with other school personnel such as counselors or other teachers on academic or non-academic problems of individual students occur less than once per week.

Item #4

Teachers reported that they use a variety of kinds of prizes, privilodges, or other verbal or non-verbal rewards to encourage good academic work in reading. The following is a list of rewards reported by the teachers:

1. Read special books, use a typewriter, stars, seals, games, verbal praise, physical hugs, smiles, read a story or poem, candy.

2. Reward I have comes from within child - work well done.

3. Stickers, clap as a class for those who've done well, comments on papers or orally, occasionally a prize, such as a book.

4. Privileges to read in reading chair when work is finished, prizes for SRA and schoolhouse completion. Poems on bulletin board - poetree. Very good papers in creative writing put up on wall where a picture of the "Fonz" says "Hey, good work!"

5. Students may select different activities to do. Treats are given for reading contest or for completing some types of work.

6. Stickers, stamps, "Excellent" puzzles for students who rate, games, comic book reading time and magazines.

7. Earned free time.

8. Verbal praise, pictures, stamps on papers.

9. Certificate, Dolch 5 minute club, candy, winner of games get 2 pieces rest of class 1, much praise given to pupils showing progress for good thinking, a good suggestion, etc.

10. Send them a written note telling them they did a good job, certificate of achievement for completion of a book, unit, etc.

Item #5

Teachers reported the following types of prizes, or other verbal or nonverbal rewards they use to encourage classroom behavior and discipline:

1. Stars, stamps, praise.

2. Verbally praised, extra time for recess.

3. Children expected to do their best and be kind and considerate to other children.

4. Popcorn, candy, games, praise, written remark of encouragement on paper.

5. Treats, stickers for bikes and desk, verbal approval to the group.

6. Letter grades, earned free time.

7. Verbal remarks, accentuate the positive, foster good self-concept.

8. Games or activities the students enjoy.

Page Four:

Item #6

Teachers reported the following types of things that they use to reprimand or punish students for poor academic performance:

1. Very messy work must be done over.

2. Usually re-do work until it is satisfactory.

3. Students are shown their mistakes or given an opportunity to do it over.

4. Students are encouraged to do better, do they understand what they do wrong. It depends on the student.

5. A note in a form of deficiency report to parents. Talk to individual students pointing out his problems. Students are never reprimanded.

6. Ask, how the student could have done better, do not punish for poor academic performance.

7. Students are asked if they know why they did a poor job. If the student knew what to do but couldn't, the lesson needs to be retaught in a different manner.

Item #7

Teachers reported the following kinds of things to reprimand or punish students for inappropriate classroom behavior and discipline:

1. Verbal expression, such as lets not do that again, miss some recess, denied extra privilodges, paddling is used as a last resort.

2. Usually separate from the rest of the group.

3. Classroom has a list of "unwanted" and the punishment for these.

4. No free time, removal from group activity.

5. Discuss why this behavior is not acceptable in the room.

Item #8

Teachers reported that on the average students from one reading level work with students from another reading level group or help each other at least 3 to 4 times per week.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS
STRUCTURE

Item #1

Teachers reported that in the daily planning for their reading classes the sources most often used were their own reading plan, and the basal readers teachers' manual.

Item #2

Teachers reported that the sources of objectives for teaching reading utilized most often were objectives from the basal and reading materials and objectives which the teacher has devised.

Item #3

Teachers reported that the techniques they use most often to make students aware of specific instructional objectives they are to master in reading are:

1. Vocabulary cards, chalkboard, pictures, question and answer period and discussion.

2. Expect them to learn a step at a time repeat; drill.

3. Made aware as they're introduced and practiced.

4. Story and workbook pages are on board for each group. Each group is given specific directions for work to do and hour to do it. Each individual covers a program of phonics by folders - work skill units and reading, which stresses critical thinking.

5. Chalkboard, composition booklet, workbooks.

6. Sometimes I read the actual objectives from my plan. At other times we indirectly discuss the objectives as we cover directions. At times I'm certain the students are not aware of specific objectives.

7. Verbal discussion, written on board, inferred in directions - discuss.

Item #4

Teachers reported that at the beginning of the school year decisions on where a student should start reading are most often based on the Botel phonics mastery, individual reading tests, the use of standardized test and from the placement of a student at the end of a previous year.

Item #5

There appeared to be some disagreement among the grade level teachers as to the availability of a placement test for placing students in reading materials. Five teachers responded positively in relationship to a placement test with the basal text series, and four teachers said no or didn't know if there was one available.

Item #6

Teachers reported that it was usually very difficult to use the results of the basal placement test to match student and reading materials.

Item #7

The majority of teachers reported that on the average students are formally tested for mastery of reading skills less than once a week.

Item #8

Teachers said that the two most often used methods for assessing student mastery of specific reading skills were informal teacher judgment and by the results of teacher developed tests.

Item #9

Teachers reported that the two most frequently used methods for the results of tests are for assigning specific materials to students and for assessing mastery.

Item #10 and #11

Teachers reported the following methods are used to record student mastery so that such information can be used by other teachers or staff members:

1. Office records
2. Reading skills checklist
3. Charts
4. Northwestern Reading Skills Checklist
5. Checklist to show what text they were in at the end of the year
6. Achievement Tests
7. Reading level placement for next year

Only four teachers responded positively that such records are generally accurate and helpful in placing students.

Item #12 a & b

Teachers reported that when a student does not pass a reading test the materials suggest giving special work, and that is the procedure most teachers utilize.

Item #13 and #14

The majority of teachers reported that they regroup their students in reading class that they feel will be permanent changes from one reading level group to another. The teachers reported that they make the decision based on teacher judgement.

Item #15

Teachers reported that when students complete a unit or chapter the decision on what unit or chapter will be worked on next is by following the sequence of the basal text or series.

Item #16

Teachers reported that in general depending on their grade level they were either mostly familiar or somewhat familiar with reading programs in other grade levels.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS
INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS

Item #1 a-b-c

Teachers reported that during an average week that they work with students outside of reading class on reading skills from one to four times. Teachers reported that they read aloud to students one to two times and that students read aloud to other students three to five times per week.

Item #2

Teachers reported that approximately 30% of the total instructional time during reading class is spent with the entire class, 65% is spent with small groups and 15% is spent with individual students.

Item #3 and #4

Teachers reported that disruptive behaviors during reading class was no problem. In addition, teachers reported that the disruptive behavior that does occur is less than once per class.

Item #5

Teachers responses were quite varied as to whether students on their own can obtain things such as books, supplementary materials and equipment during reading classes. Several teachers reported that students occassionally can or often can obtain these things. Three teachers reported that they always can obtain the things on their own.

Item #6

The majority of teachers reported that during a typical week they never utilize aides or assistants to help during reading class. Three teachers reported that they use aides or assistants from one or more times per week to five or more times per week.

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

Item #1

The following list of possible topics for inservice programs or workshops were identified as the highest priority by the teachers:

1. Remediation of specific reading problems.
2. Uses of management of manipulative materials.
3. Multi-media approaches to teaching reading.
4. Content review of material and organization of basal series.
5. Comprehension
6. Methods of teaching reading in the content areas.

TEACHER INTERVIEW RESULTS

The following results were obtained by analyzing the responses given by the following grade level teachers:

2 Grade 1
2 Grade 2
2 Grade 3
2 Grade 4
2 Grade 5
1 Grade 6
11 - Total Responding

PROGRAM ANALYSIS OPPORTUNITY

Item #1

Grouping for the reading program ranges from a high of six groups in some classes to a low of three gorups in one class. Most teachers grouped the children in high, average and low groups; with sub groups within these levels. The students tended to be in larger groups in the Intermediate grades and smaller groups in the primary grades. The grouping situation is not uncommon, in that children receive more individual instruction at the primary level when they are being presented the basic skills and skill development for reading.

Item #2 and #3

Teachers reported that students in grades two through six receive additional reading instruction from a special reading instructor. Approximately 63 students were identified from the lower reading groups that receive this special instruction, the highest being 20 in fifth grade and 5 to 7 in second grade.

The amount of time the students receive this instruction ranged from a low of 60 minutes at the sixth grade level to a high of 120 minutes at grades two, three and four.

Item #4

Teachers reported that on the average, they spend around 50 minutes on reading seatwork outside the time actually spent on the teaching of reading. The range of time spent was from a high of 105 minutes for the entire class, to 25 minutes for the low groups. Most teachers indicated that the time varies for the high and low reading groups.

Item #5

Seven teachers reported that they assign some type of reading homework and the teachers that didn't indicated that although not on a regular basis, students may be assigned incomplete seatwork. The types of homework ranged from oral reading and workbook activities to vocabulary words and book reports.

Item #6

Teachers reported using a variety of textbooks for the basal readers with their reading groups. The two most often used were the Economy Series and Ginn Series. Teachers indicated that different series were used with the different levels of reading groups. The following is a listing of the textbooks, grade levels and level of readers:

Grade Level	Textbook	Publisher	Level of Readers
1	Greenfeet Fun With Family On Cherry Street Fun With Family Little White House Little Blue Storybook Sally, Dick & Jane	Economy Ginn Scott-Foresman	From readiness to first reader
2	Mustard Seed Magic Greenfeet Curbstone Dragon We are Neighbors Little White House Around the Corner Together We Go	Economy Ginn Harcourt Brace	From 2.2 to pre-primer
3	Mysterious-Wisterious Curbstone Dragon Mustard Seed Magic Neighbors Far/Near City Sidewalk	Economy Ginn MacMillan	From 3.2 to 2.1
4	Silver Twist Mysterious-Wisterious Air-Puddy-Wind Mustard Seed Magic Open Highways	Economy Scott-Foresman	From 4.5 to 2.5
5	F, G, H, I New Streets/Roads Cinnamin Peaks	Lippencott Economy	5.0 to 2.0
6	Lavendar Skywriters Cinnamon Peaks Silver Twist	Economy	6.0 to 4.0

Item #7

In addition to the basal textbooks used by the teacher, the following are the basal text series materials reported being utilized by the teachers. Different materials are used with different levels of students. The materials are listed for all grade levels and indicates both the similarity of the materials and the variety of materials teachers use.

Language Experiences in Reading
Dittoes
Student Workbooks
Teacher's manual
SRA
Phonics Word Power
Textbook tests
Phonics books
Activity books

Item #8

In addition to the basal series materials, all the teachers reported using the following types of supplementary materials in teaching reading with the different level groups.

Paperbacks
Monster books
Library books
Talking Alphabet
Teacher made materials
Games
Packets
Flash Cards
Records
Magic Carpets
Reading Activities Cards
Hays dittoes
Spelling Games
Worksheets
Vocabulary drill
Filmstrips
Skill books
Newspaper
Comic Books
Reader's Digest

PROGRAM ANALYSIS MOTIVATORS

Item #1, #2, #3, #4

Items one, two, three and four relate to the teacher's perceptions on how interesting the basal textbooks, the workbooks, supplementary reading activities and the classroom library books are for each of the reading level groups, at each grade level. Most teachers reported that reading materials found in their classroom were interesting to the students "at grade level" and "above grade level". However, several teachers reported that the reading materials for the lower level students were only "O.K.", particularly for students at the fifth and sixth grade level.

Item #5

Most teachers reported that students within each reading level group have an opportunity to help each other out on assignments or work together. Six teachers reported that it occurs at least one to two times per week, five teachers stated that it occurs anywhere from three

Item #5, Con't.

to four times to a maximum of five times or more. The amount of time spent was different between the high and low reading level groups, the higher groups spending more time and the lower groups spending less.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS STRUCTURE

Item #1

Teachers reported that they may add or delete objectives included in the reading curriculum for all reading groups. Responses ranged from never to less than once per week at the first grade level, to three to four times per week at the fifth grade level. Several teachers reported that changes are made more frequently for the lower level reading groups than the higher level groups.

Item #2

Teacher responses indicated that the majority of teachers do make changes, either at the beginning of a lesson or unit or at the end of a lesson by adding supplementary materials. Teachers also indicated that the changes are made according to the needs of the reading group or individual student.

Item #3

The following are the types of changes made by all the teachers.

a. Use of films on particular days
b. Extra time on vocabulary
c. Word building, critical thinking
d. Practice words
e. Word games
f. Vocabulary words
g. Review and reteach certain skills
h. Questioning techniques
i. Chapter report
j. Work page review
k. Additional reading materials of high interest, low reading level
l. Alter the format for presenting new material

Item #4 and #5

Items four and five deal with the teacher's perceptions on how appropriate are the basal reading materials and the supplementary materials for meeting the needs of students in the reading level groups. Over 70% of the teachers responding felt that both the basal materials and supplementary materials were either entirely appropriate or most appropriate for meeting the needs of the students in all reading level groups. However, several teachers indicated that the materials were only somewhat appropriate for the lower level reading groups and two teachers felt they were entirely inappropriate for some of the lower reading level groups.

Item #6

Ninety per cent of the teachers responded that the assignments for most students were either all the same or mostly the same for the different level reading groups. When several or all of the assignments were individualized, it was for the lower level reading groups.

Item #7

Teachers reported that over the last two months the highest number of stories that were completed by a student in the higher level reading groups was forty stories. For that same length of time, the highest number of stories completed by a student in the lower level reading groups was twenty stories. The smallest number of stories completed by a student in the higher level reading groups was ten. For the student in the lower level reading groups, the smallest number was four stories.

APPENDIX X

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
MAY 17, 1978

Data was available from one principal of this questionnaire. The principal represents the school site grades K-6.

OPPORTUNITY

Items #1 and #2

The elementary principal reported that 122 students have transferred into the school and 33 students have transferred out. There are 180 student days in the school year.

Item #3

The principal reported that the following activities happen during a school day:

a. Students arrive - 8:30

b. Classes begin - 9:05

c. Students are dismissed - 3:30 - 4:00

Item #4

For a typical student each day the following times are scheduled for:

a. Recess - 30 minutes

b. Lunch - 30 minutes

Item #5

On the average, during a typical school year, school days are shortened or cancelled due to late starts, early dismissals or snow emergencies - around 1 or 2 days.

Item #6

The principal reported that for a typical student reading or reading related instruction, the following amount of time is scheduled:

Primary level - 80 minutes

Intermediate level - 40 minutes

Item #7

The principal basal reader series currently being used is the Economy Series K-6.

Items #8 and #9

The following standardized tests are used in the school to measure overall achievement in reading: Grades 1 through 6 - Stanford Achievement Test
Grade 3 - Otis-Lennon Mental Ability

The tests will be administered to the classes in May of this year.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS REPORT
CRITERION RELEVANT INSTRUCTION
MAY 17, 1978

Number of teachers responding: 1 - Grade 4
1 - Grade 5
1 - Grade 6
3 Total responses

The tables below present the results of the analysis of the Stanford Achievement Test, Intermediate Level II for three teachers, grades 4, 5, and 6. The tables represent the percentages of responses for each category. The column on the left represents the total number of responses possible for each section of the test. *Example: Number of items 50, 3 respondents; total number of possible responses 150. There are five categories or sections of the test.

1. Vocabulary
2. Reading Comprehension
3. Word Study Skills
4. Spelling
5. Language

Test Section	Number of Items	Taught Same Format	Taught Different Format	Assume Taught Earlier	Assume Taught Later	No Response
I. Vocabulary Total number of responses 150	50	11%	83%	5%	1%	0
II. Reading Comprehension Total number of responses 213	71	95%	4%	1%	0	0
III. Word Study Skills Total number of responses 150	50	73%	9%	0	17%	0
IV. Spelling Total number of responses 180	60	12%	80%	4%	4%	0
V. Language Total Number of responses 240	80	25%	62%	5%	8%	0

JUNE 8, 1978
ATTACHMENT I

PROGRAM NEEDS STATEMENT

Who is affected?

Teachers 1-6

Students 1-6

What are the major program needs?

1. Inadequate use of the uniform record system. Teachers feel the present system is too cumbersome.
2. Lack of appropriate basal related and supplementary materials for the lower level students. In addition, there appears to be a need for inservice education in the use of these materials.
3. There appears to be a need for the total staff to become more familiar with the total reading/language arts program which includes the scope and sequence.
4. There is a need for a positive correlation between reading skills and objectives and format as they relate to the standardized testing program.
5. There is a need to initiate methods in the present program to improve the students' self-concept.

What are the goals for improvement?

1. The goal is to obtain an effective and less cumbersome management system.
2. The goal is to obtain additional basal related and supplementary materials for the lower level student. In addition, teachers will be provided staff development on the most effective use of these materials.
3. Teachers will be provided with information on the total reading/language arts program so as to bring about more continuity and better understanding of the program.
4. To analyze the present standardized testing program as it relates to the total reading/language arts program. It is recommended to obtain an item analysis on the SAT administered June, 1978, grades 3-5.
5. Teachers will provide positive reinforcements to students by having them work at their appropriate instructional level. It is recommended that available affective programs be reviewed for possible inclusion in the present instructional program.

JUNE 8, 1978
ATTACHMENT III

GENERAL NEEDS STATEMENT	PULSE SESSION	STUDENT NEEDS	PROGRAM NEEDS
Improve student motivation	Children's background, Low S.E.C. rural poor	Student self-concept is negative for too large of % of the students.	Initiate methods in the present program to improve student's self-concept. Review available affective programs for inclusion into the program.
Identify and adapt a reading management system that would improve the continuity of the reading/language arts program.	Most teachers do not follow the present reading course of study.		The staff needs to become more familiar with the total reading program.
Students K-6 not working up to their ability.	Students who are underachieving.	Grades 4-6 reading comprehension and vocabulary, particularly as they relate to written and oral expression. Transfer of skills to be mastered to relevant oral and written excercises.	
	Insufficient variety of supplementary materials.		Lack of appropriate basal related and supplementary materials.
Teacher directed activities that would provide students an opportunity to take on more responsibility for completing assignments.			

APPENDIX XX

PROGRAM ANALYSIS COMMENTS

A. Opportunity:

1. Ample time is provided for instruction, however, there is a great deal of difference in how the time is used by the individual teachers.

2. Bi-Basal in grades 1-4
   Tri-Basal in grade 5
   Basal in grade 6

3. Wide variety of reading materials for supplementary work, however, *the quantity of each is not proportional to the needs. Some question as to the appropriate use.

4. In 3 out of 5 categories over 60% on the S.A.T., the questions are presented in a format different from that normally used in the classroom.

B. Motivators:

1. Some indication that current materials are not entirely appropriate for lower level student.

2. Considerable use made of the "buddy" system for learning.

3. Little indication of the use of peer tutoring.

4. A great attempt is made to provide students with fast feedback in regards to assignments, test, etc.

5. There is a minimum of self directed activities.

6. Extensive use of awards for good work (praise, pat-on-back, prizes).

C. Structure:

1. Teachers find considerable need to revise, add to or delete objectives (primarily with lower level students).

2. Considerable attempt by teachers to vary teaching strategies.

3. *There is evidence that some supplementary materials are inappropriate.

4. Teachers use uniform assignments within reading levels. They are more individualized for lower level students.

5. Basal objectives are supplemented by teacher devised objectives and other sources.

6. Teachers use a variety of means of advising the students of the objectives being taught.

7. *Teacher judgement and teacher made tests are used in most cases for student placement.

8. Mastery of skills is usually determined by teacher judgement or teacher made tests.

9. There is a lack of a uniform record system.

10. Regrouping is common practice.

11. A number of teachers are not familiar with the total reading program.

D. Instructional Events:

1. The majority of the teacher's time is devoted to small groups (55%) with the least amount (15%).

2. Disruptive behavior is not a major concern.

3. Considerable difference in the degree to which teachers permit students to access materials.

4. Teacher perceive a need for inservice in the following:

   a. Remediation of specific problems

   b. Management of supplementary materials

   c. Multi media approaches

   d. Review of content and organization of basal

   e. Reading in content areas.

TPC/sh

MAY 23, 1978

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS
I. Comprehension	Stanford Achievement Test (April, 1977)	Grade 1 20-55-25 Grade 2 20-55-25 Grade 3 20-60-20 Grade 4 20-60-20 Grade 5 20-60-20 Grade 6 20-60-20	4-37-60 12-46-42 16-52-32 17-47-37 17-63-20 13-58-29
II. Vocabulary	Stanford Achievement Test (April, 1977)	Grade 1 15-60-25 Grade 2 15-45-40 Grade 3 15-60-25 Grade 4 20-60-20 Grade 5 20-55-25 Grade 6 20-60-20	3-44-53 4-52-44 6-52-42 15-58-27 22-62-16 15-64-21
III. Affective A self concept	Attitude toward Reading CPRT Student Survey 1-6	All students in Grades 1-6 enrolled in this school 1. 90% of the 1st grade students will have a positive self-concept. 2. 80% of the 2nd grade students will have a positive self-concept. 3. 80% of the 3rd grade students will have a positive self-concept. 4. 75% of the 4th grade students will have a positive self-concept. 5. 75% of the 5th grade students will have a positive self-concept. 6. 70% of the 6th grade students will have a positive self-concept.	According to the CPRT student survey: 1. 85% of the 1st grade students have a positive self-concept. 2. 66% of the 2nd grade students have a positive self-concept. 3. 68% of the 3rd grade students have a positive self-concept. 4. 63% of the 4th grade students have a positive self-concept. 5. 62% of the 5th grade students have a positive self-concept. 6. 57% of the 6th grade students have a positive self-concept.

APPENDIX XII

81

Who is affected?

All students K-6 self concept

All teachers

Grades 4-6 - Reading comprehension and vocabulary and particulary as they relate to written and oral expression.

What is the problem?

1. Student self concept is negative for too large a percentage of student with that % increasing from grades 1-6.

2. Even though there is little discrepancy between the desired and current outcomes in vocabulary for grades 1-6, there is a general movement from the higher stanines to the lower as the students move from grades 1-6 (based on stanines SAT April 1977.

3. Comprehension is the same.

4. Data indicates acceptable mastery of vocabulary and comprehension as measured by the S.A.T., however, there appears to be a lack of ability to apply the skills to written oral expression.

What are the goals for improvement?

1. Self Concept:
   Significantly decrease the negative deficiency shown on the charts and bring the primary and intermediate grades into closer alignment.
2. Vocabulary and Comprehension:
   To minimize the movement of students from the higher to the lower stanines in the S.A.T. results in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension as they move from grade 1 to 6.
3. Transfer of skills:
   Provide greater opportunity for students in grades 4-6 to apply the reading skills being mastered to relevant oral and written exercises.

APPENDIX IX

ATTACHMENT IV

Selection Criteria

1. Is the content presented at the appropriate level of difficulty - SEC Level?
2. Cost initial and yearly?
3. Staff and training required or included?
4. Does product include instructional materials and evaluation materials?
5. Is program compatible with present program?
6. Developers qualified in their field - validated by use?
7. Is the format attractive and varied to teachers and students - good management system?
8. Social fairness?
9. Objectives stated clearly?
10. Does the program include cognitive and/or affective?

QUESTIONS FOR USE IN PREPARING AN IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING CHART

A. Program Timing and Budgeting

1. Do you plan to implement the program in all grades? With all teachers? With all students?
2. How much time is needed to prepare for proper implementation of the program?
3. Has a firm date been established for implementation of the program? Is this date compatible with the school calendar?
4. Do any changes need to be made in the current school program in order to implement this program?
5. What are some major problems that might force us to change the implementation date?
6. Can we delay implementation if we run into serious problems?
7. Has a budget been proposed and approved by the administration for the new program?
8. What steps have been taken to seek approval, if it has not already been granted?
9. What are the major line items in the budget?
10. Is the budget realistic?

IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING CHART

ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED		DATES	STAFF RESPONSIBILITY
A. Program Timing and Budgeting		10/16-18/78	Training
1. For two teachers per grade level, K-6, 2-4 months		11/8/78	Doris Perry
2. Yes - third week in January		11/30/78	Barbara Gehr
3. Yes		12/7-8/78	Ruth Freeman
4. Not presently anticipated			Tom Carey
5. Yes - but not too long			
6. Not at this time - will be proposed			
7. Superintendent has been involved in the implementation and planning. The principals and guidance counselor will be invited to the training sessions.			
8. Approval has been given to the project by the administration			
9. 3-1/2 days for 13 substitutes	$650.00		
16 books - $5.00 per book	80.00		
16 copies of "Between Parent and Child" 2.25 per book	36.50		
2 filmstrips - $12 per filmstrip	24.00		
5 - 1/2 days for kit advisor	100.00		
1 cassett tape	2.00		
	$892.50		
10. Yes - in terms of cost effectiveness			

B. Staff Assignment, Orientation and Training

1. Have all the instructional staff been assigned and their roles defined? Support staff? Program Manager?

2. Do we need a training program for the instructional and/or support staff?

3. What kind of training program for each staff?

4. Who will do the training?

5. When will the training occur?

6. Where will the training take place?

7. Who should attend the training?

8. Does a list of questions to be addressed during training need to be compiled? Should this list be sent to the trainer prior to training?

9. Does a training evaluation form need to be developed?

10. Will the implementation of the program be monitored?

11. Should an orientation to the program be conducted for administrators and teachers in this school and in feeder or sender schools?

12. When should each of these orientations occur?

13. How can we obtain funds for the training activity?

14. Should parents be oriented to the program? What information should they be given?

IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING CHART

ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED	DATES	STAFF RESPONSIBILITY
B. Staff Assignment, Orientation, and Training 1. Yes and more specific assignments will be made after 11/30/78 meeting. 2. Yes, for the instructional staff. 3. PATL 4. Barb Gehr, Doris Perry, Ruth Freeman and the I. U. Coordinator. 5. December 7 and 8 and 1/2 day in January 1979. 6. Northwestern Elementary School 7. Assigned staff K-6, Building Principal and Guidance Counselor 8. Yes - to be discussed November 30, 1978 meeting 9. One is available by the developer. 10. Yes, by the kit advisor. 11. Yes, strategy will be to present an overview to both school faculties and administrators. 12. Before the 12/7-8/78 training days. 13. District will supply the funds for substitutes on 12/7-8/78 14. Yes - through PTO and notice to parents.		

C. Materials, Equipment, and Facilities

1. What elements of the program are being used?
2. Do we have a list of all materials and equipment needed?
3. Is an inventory of existing materials needed?
4. Have the materials and equipment that are not currently available been ordered?
5. Who is responsible for inventorying materials as they are received?
6. Where will the materials be stored?
7. Does a filing system need to be set up?
8. Do any materials need to be developed?
9. Do any materials need to be reproduced?
10. Do check-out procedures need to be developed for the materials?
11. Have arrangements been made for distribution of materials or installation of equipment?
12. Do any record-keeping forms need to be developed?
13. Will any changes need to be made on the report cards?
14. Are the necessary facilities reserved and schedules prepared for their use?
15. Are any modifications needed to the existing facilities? How much time will such alterations take?

IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING CHART

ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED	DATES	STAFF RESPONSIBILITY
C. Materials, Equipment, and Facilities		
1. Self-concept kit		
2. Yes		
3. Yes - I. U. is presently conducting an inventory		
4. No - will be done by the LAT Coordinator on November 9, 1978		
5. Program manager - Doris Perry		
6. Central location - aides room		
7. Yes - a filing cabinet will be furnished by the district		
8. Not at this time		
9. I. U. will produce the first set of materials		
10. Yes		
11. Not at the present time - it will be done at a later date		
12. Yes		
13. Not at this time - input may be provided at a later date		
14. N/A		
15. N/A		

D. Student Scheduling and Instructional Procedures

1. How much time is needed each day to implement the program?
2. Is a school schedule needed for the program?
3. Do students need to be grouped within or between classes? By what means will the students be grouped?
4. Do students need to be tested at the beginning of the program?
5. Is a student orientation to the program needed? What topics covered?
6. Are the instructional procedures clearly defined in the program descriptions or the published manuals for the program?
7. Is the scope of each activity clearly defined?
8. Has a sequence for each activity been determined?
9. Will all students follow the same sequence?

IMPLEMENTATION PLAQNING CHART

ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED	DATES	STAFF RESPONSIBILITY
D. Student Scheduling and Instructional Procedures This section relates to students. The LAT altered it to include teachers. 1. On-going 2. No 3. Some students may be identified for evaluation purposes 4. Yes - parent permission requested 5. No 6. Yes - manual is provided for a guide 7, 8, and 9. Yes, particularly for teacher training		

APPENDIX XVI

PATL EVALUATION INTERVIEW

1. Is the program being implemented as it was intended? What are some of the indicators?

2. Is the program accomplishing what the teachers wanted it to do?

3. Was the training sufficient enough to allow for a smooth transition to implementation?

4. Is the program successful enough to warrant expansion to other classrooms?

5. Has there been interest generated among other teachers?

6. Did the teachers complete the activities related to the behavioral objectives?

7. What has been the impact on teacher attitudes?

8. Is the time for the kit advisor activities realistic?

9. Are the materials accessible? storage? filing? inventory?

10. How often did the program need to be modified?

11. How appropriate are the materials? activities?

12. How much time is required to implement the program?

13. Has the program increased communication between teachers and students? teacher to teacher?

14. Has the program increased communications between staff members? If so, in what ways?

15. Do the materials, kit manual and supplementary materials, provide sufficient assistance in implementing PATL?

APPENDIX XVII

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT
PATL COMMUNICATION MODEL
PATL VISITATION FORM

I. TEACHER CONVEYS MEANING OF PROBLEM SITUATION

___ A. Teacher states problem.

___ B. Teacher describes problem using the group or herself; may include offering choices of solution.

___ C. Teacher removes stimuli triggering problem situation.

II. TEACHER HAS EMOTIONS (FEELINGS INCLUDING ANGER) ABOUT A SITUATION - EXPRESSES THE FEELINGS WITH I: INCLUDE WHAT IS WRONG AND WHAT IS EXPECTED. (A RULE IF AVAILABLE.)

___ A. Owns and describes personal feelings

___ B. Problem situation.

___ C. Reality or expectation.

III. TEACHER ACKNOWLEDGES STUDENT'S FEELINGS.

___ A. Teacher uses "you" to reflect back child's plight complaint or request.

___ B. Teacher uses "you" to help clarify for self and child the child's feelings.

___ C. Teacher accepts child's feelings but limits action (may offer choices) expresses own feelings about situation.

IV. TEACHER USES PRAISE TO STATE WHAT HE LIKES ABOUT A SITUATION.

___ A. Teacher describes the improvement or change of the situation.

___ B. Teacher describes his or her feelings about the situation.

I & II. TEACHER MAKES VALUE JUDGMENT OF THE CHILD. EVALUATES CHARACTER OF THE CHILD.

___ A. Immediately given order.

___ B. Nags.

___ C. Moralizes.

___ D. Uses "you" to describe the child - includes sarcasm.

III. TEACHER FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE FEELINGS.

___ A. Teacher provides hasty solution to problem.

___ B. Teacher uses "I" message to react to student's feelings.

IV. TEACHER JUDGES OR EVALUATES THE PERSON IN PRAISE.

Reinforcement - Verbal

Positive
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Delayed Differential

Negative
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .

Non-Verbal

Positive

Negative

INDEX

(RDU Case Studies)

	Page
Administrators in Local Site	
Relations With	
Faculty	5, 6
Community	5
Style (participatory/authoritarian, etc.)	5, 6, 28, 36
Support/Non-support of	
Linker	8
Project	8, 28, 32, 33, 35, 37
Community	
Attitudes Toward	
Education	5
School or District	5
Characteristics	
Political	4
Socio-economic	4
Racial	4
Problems With	5, 9
Faculty	
Morale, Climate, Interpersonal Relations	6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 36
Professional Characteristics	6, 10, 11
Implementation of R & D Product	
Evaluation, Feedback, Assessment	26, 27, 30
Fidelity/Adaptation of Product	30
Problems With	36
Process, How It Was Done	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30
Scope (personnel, students, schools involved)	25, 26
Success/Failure	42
Linker	
Activities, tasks performed	8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36
Resource Agency	33
Personality Factors	32, 33, 35, 36
Problems of Role	32, 33, 35, 36
Access, Entry into Site	32
Complexity, Multiplicity of Tasks	32
Participation of Site in Project	
Motivation For, Functions of	8
Selection Process (including voluntariness)	8, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24

Problem, Local Educational
Characteristics (centrality, scope, complexity, etc) 9, 10
Identification Process, Needs Assessment 10, 11, 12

Problem-solving Model
Institutionalization of 36, 37

Product or Program, R & D
Selection Process (including participants) 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
Role of Linker in Final Selection. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25

Project, Central
Goals (substance, clarity, etc.) 1, 2, 3, 8, 9

Resource Base(s)
Characteristics of Agency (functions, goals, structure, resources, etc. 1, 2, 3
Level of Effort or Involvement in Project 9, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26

Resources, Physical (money, material, equipment)
District Site 5
School Site 6

School Site
Major Events, Changes (e.g., New School, New Superintendent, Fire, Teacher Strike, Weather, etc.) 5, 9
Precedents for Innovation (good and bad) 5
Precedents for Project Specifically (good and bad) 5
Structure (size, levels, etc.) 6

Search for R & D Product, Program
Cost 22
Process, Activities (meetings, depth, effort, problems, participants) 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
Role of Linker 35

State of Region
Characteristics
Political 4, 5
Racial. 4, 5
Socio-Economic 4, 5

Students in Site
Academic Characteristics (educational problems, etc.) 5, 6, 12
Socio-economic Characteristics 4

Team, Local Action
Attitudes Toward or Expectations of Linker (understanding, cooperation, etc.) 6, 9

Attitudes Toward or Expectations of Project (support/resistance, etc.) 6, 9, 10
Composition 6
Leadership 6
Level of Effort, Sense of Ownership, Commitment 32
Problems 6
Tasks Planned 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36

Technical Assistance Consultants (not Linker)
External to District 25
Tasks Performed 25

Unintended Effects, Outcomes, Consequences (positive or negative) for
Linker or Linker Role 35, 37
Participants Locally 32, 33, 34, 35
Project Headquarters. 35
School/District Site 32, 34, 35
Students. 34, 37